THE ARAB REJECTION OF ISRAEL: A Philosophical Approach And Analysis

BY

HAZIM T. MUSHTAK,

B.A. (A.U.B. 1952),

B. Lit. (Oxon. 1961),

Head of the Philopsophy Department,

College of Arts,

University of Baghdad.

Publication Assisted by the

University of Baghdad

AL-ANI PRESS, BAGHDAD

1976

IN HUMBLE AND PROUD DEDICATION

To The Gallant Soldiers of all the Arab Armed Forces, and to the fighting men and women of the Arab Palestinian Resistance, those heroes and martyrs who already fell, and those who will yet fall, in the faith that "there are things more horrible than death, and things more precious than life, and that there is a life that is worse than death and a death greater than life.

Their life was struggle; their death heroism, their sacrifice sacred, their memory eternal". They have willingly and consciously chosen to tread the path which leads to inevitable death, that Arabia may live.

H. T. M.

PREFACE

This book is mainly a collection of lectures delivered by the author, at different times and places, during the years 1964-1971, as indicated in the marginal notes; at the annual Palestine Day Conference in London, organized by the Arab Students Union in the U.K.; at the British Royal Naval Staff College at Greenwich, where he spoke annually, by the kind and hospitable invitation of the Commander, on Arab Nationalism and International Zionism; at the Palestine Week held in Amman, Jordan, which he attended as the guest of the Arab Palestinian Resistence in 1968; and at the 23rd Plenary Assembly of the World Federation of United Nations organizations held at Luxemburg in 1971, where he represented the Iraqi U.N.A., and submitted a memorandum on Anti-Semitism, in refutation of false allegations circulated by the Israeli delegation, headed by Prof. Benjamin Axin, President of the Haifa University.

These lectures discuss the manifold currents and the various aspects involved in the tragic and explosive problem of Arab Palestine; the causes, consequences and prospects of the Arab-Israeli conflict; and the possible or actual international reactions and political tensions they entailed or produced — as seen through the eyes of a Social Nationalist and articulate Arab, who lived many and eventful years in the U.K., both as a scholar first and then as a diplomat. Steeped in the best traditions of Western and British scholarship, he remained profoundly faithful and deeply loyal to the cultural ideals and historical values of his ancient heritage and reborn nation.

Recent events in the Middle East have produced far and wide reprecussions. But they did not disprove

the main and essential contentions held by the author in these lectures. On the contrary, he rather feels that they have confirmed them. The author, therefore, has reproduced these lectures as they were actually delivered at the time, without change and without alteration, execept slightly and occasionally.

Last, but not least, the author wishes modestly to record his great debt to prof. Walid al-Khalidi, author of (Reappraisal: An Examination Of Certain Western Attitudes To The Palestine Problem) and (why Did The Palestinians Leave? An Examination Of The Zionist Version Of The Exodus Of 1948), as well as Mr. Erskine Childers, author of (Palestine: The Broken Triangle) and (The Other Exodus). Their works will always shine as worthy examples of sound scholarship and strict methodology. The author has used long quotations from both in the course of many years. Sources have been indicated where possible. But neither time nor space has allowed much in this respect. The author, therefore, extends his regrets. However, he stresses the fact that he, and he alone, bears the sole responsibility for the views expressed and the conclusions reached in this book, being perhaps the very first comprehensive Arab intellectual attempt of its kind in English, treating the logic of Arab Rejection in a philosophical approach and analysis, in the light of the Zionist nightmare that engulfed Arab Palestine. This specifically philosophical attempt is particularly stressed in Chapter 1 (The Logic of Fait Accompli: A Preliminary Analysis And A Tentative Discussion), and Chapter 4 (Arabia Reborn: A Great Past And A Greater Future. Our National Revolution Is Socialist. On The Nemesis of Cultures, States And Nations).

HAZIM T. MUSHTAK
Baghdad, February, 1974.

CONTENTS

Subject		Page
	Dedication.	3
	Preface.	5
1—	FAIT ACCOMPLI:	
	Palestine Day in London on 16 May, 1964.	11
	Erskine Children.	11
	The Logic of Fait Accompli: A Preliminary Analysis and A Tentative Discussion.	13
	Dead End.	13
	Delenda Est Carthago.	15
	Fait Accompli:	23
	Simple Proposition: Factual Statement.	23
	Complex Proposition: Prophetic And Threatening Undertones.	26
	Doubtful Advantages.	28
	Arab Expendability.	30
	Zionist Territorial Claims.	32
	Questions and Answers.	38
2—	EXODUS:	
	The Arab Exodus of 1948-1949: How And Why Did The Palestinian Arabs Leave Their Country?	42
	How And Why Did It Happen?	46
	Notes.	51
3—	TRIANGLE:	
	Palestine Day in London on 15 May 1965:	55
	Erskine Childers.	56
	Arab Nationalism, Western Imperialism and International Zionism: Fact And Fiction.	58
	Tribute To Edward Atiyah.	58
	"Arabia": Yesterday And Today.	59

Subject		Page
	Israel: Fait Accompli And Status Quo.	59
	Fact And Conclusion.	60
	Prophecy.	61
	Threat.	62
	Will The West Ever Awake?	62
4—	RESURGENCE:	
	Arabia Reborn:	
	A Great Past And	
	A Greater Future.	
	Our National Revolution In Socialist.	64
	On The Nemesis	
	Of Cultures, States And Nations.	70
5—	IDENTITY:	
	Zionism and Anti-Semitism:	
	Two Sides Of The Same Coin.	77
	Israel: A Colonial Anachronism.	
	Zionist Anti-Colonial False Pretences.	78
	Anti-Zionists: Ever, Anti-Semitics: Never.	79
	Zionism And Anti-Semitism:	
	Two Sides Of The Same Coin.	81
	Israel : Talks Peace Amd Wages War.	82
	Peace With Zulus.	86
	Arnold Toynbee:	
	On Nazis, Zionists and Arabs.	89
	The Yiddish Curtain:	
	Land of Milk and Honey — For Whom?	
	Iraqi-Born Jew Unmasks Israel.	93
6—	PRESS:	
	The British Press and the	
	Palestine Question:	
	A Conversation With Lord Thomson.	97
7—	PARTITION:	
	The British Mandate And The Partition	

Subject		Page
	of Palestine:	
	A Conversation With Lord Caradon.	99
8—	THEFT:	
	The Thief And The Owner of the House:	
	Who Stole What From Whom?	
	A Memorandum To The World Federation	
	of United Nations Organizations.	103
	APPENDICES.	109
	Biographical Notes on:	
	A. Lord Thomson.	109
	B. Lord Caradon.	111
	C. The Author.	112
	SOURCES.	115

CHAPTER ONE

FAIT ACCOMPLI

PALESTINE DAY IN LONDON, ON 16th MAY 1964(*):

The Arab students in Britain held their annual Palestine Day Conference in The Conway Hall, Holborn, on 16th May, 1964. The speakers were, Mr. Erskine Childers, the well-known writer and broadcaster, Mr. Hazim Mushtak, Press Attache at the Iraqi Embassy in London, and Mr. Mazin Bandak, a Palestinian Journalist.

Erskine Childers(**)

Mr. Erskine Childers began his speech — as he rightly does on all such occasions — by making his position *vis-a-vis* the Jewish question crystal-clear, by emphasizing that he is not and has never been anti-semitic, that his opposition to Zionism is entriely a political opposition to a wrongful and disastrous poltical act, regardless of the race or religion of those who perpetrate it; and that indeed, as a Westerner he feels a two-fold shame — shame for the abominable persecution of the Jews under Nazi Germany, and shame for the wrong done to the Arabs in Palestine, for the attempt by the West to make amends to the Jews of Europe by inflicting a grievous injustice on the Arabs who had never wronged the Jews. He gave point to his argument by referring to what he called: "the

---

(*) Reproduced from the issue of **the Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq in London of June 1964, Page 16. Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons, Ltd., Hertford, Herts, England.

(**) The author of **Common Sense About The Arab World** (1960); and **The Road to Suez — A Study in Western — Arab Relations** (1962).

beautifully orchestrated campaign known as the Mancroft Affairs", and going on to say: "I watched the Arabs in general and Arab governments in particular being denounced for the crime of anti-semitism of which my people were guilty but the Arabs were not".

Mr. Childers described Zionism as, "the greatest confidence-trick of our time", and went on to argue convincingly that since its beginnings the intention of the Zionist leaders and their supporters in Britain had been ultimately to remove the Arabs from Palestine. He quoted Lord Boothby's recent admission that this had been the intention also of the original draft of the Balfour Declaration and described how Lord Boothby had been "savaged by the *Jewish Chronicle*" for making this statement.

THE LOGIC OF FAIT ACCOMPLI(1)

A Preliminary Analysis And A Tentative Discussion

Dead End:

British and American voices, in particular, are often raised, advising the Arabs to adopt a "moderate", "positive", "wise" and "realistic" attitude to the problem of Palestine. "The prevailing Western tendency, both at government and non-government levels, is to reiterate the following formula: The existence of Israel is a fact that must be accepted; The *status quo* must be maintained"(2). Sometime motives of unselfish concern and feelings of sincere friendship are detected. Sometimes Perfidious and hypocritcial designs cast their dark and ugly shadows. But always and invariably the same unwarranted conclusions are drawn, the lessons of history and the laws of logic are ignored, to the advantage of the Zionists and at

---

(1) This lecture, of which an enlarged version is printed here, was delivered by the author on Palestine Day in London, on May 16th., 1964, and originally published in the Bulletin of the Embassy of the Republic of Iraq in London of June 1964. P. 19, etc. The logic of Fait Accompli in relation to the existence of Israel, received its first original treatment at the hands of Prof. Walid Khalidi, a historian, writer and presently head of the political science research department at the American University of Beirut as well as the director of the Institute for Palestine studies. Based on a talk originally given to the Arab Cultural Club, it was published as an article entitled (Reappraisal: An Examination of Certain Western Attitudes to the Palestine Problem), the Middle East Forum (AUB), Beirut, Summer 1958. Vol. 34. No. 8.

(2) Erskine B. Childers, Palestine: The Broken Triangle, The Journal of International Affairs, New York, 1965. Vol. 19. No. 1: Page 37.

the expense of the Arabs. Many West Europeans, Englishmen and Americans would unhesitatingly admit often with sympathy and understanding' that the Arab case is morally unanswerable, so long as such discussions and encounters remain in the realm of theory, and so long as they deal with the past. But as soon as the Arabs turn to concrete, definite and practical steps, in their present and future dimensions, these discussions and encounters face a paradox and reach a *cul de sac.* In the words of Prof. Khalidi " a parting of the ways takes place"[1].

Non-Arabs very often readily concede the following aspects of the Arab point of view: the Balfour Declaration was immoral and unjust as a betrayal of British promises in fact made to the Arabs but in fact unkept, The British repudiated their moral and political duty fixed by the mandate when they suddenly withdrew from Palestine exposing the original people of the country to the gravest peril, the partition decision of the United Nations was imposed by direct and Partisan pressure and does not reflect the free will of the international community, the total destruction of the Arab Palestinian community was the inhuman and invitable climax of implementing the policy of a Jewish National home in Palesttine[2]. All this and much more is admitted or conceded by many fair-minded and freedom-loving observers. Yet very often they would say: "But Israel is now here". This is what Prof. Khalidi calls "a dead end"[3]. It is also our corner-stone and starting-point in examining the logic of *Fait Accompli.*

(1) Prof. Khalidi, op. cit. Page 3.

(2) Ibid. p. 3-5.

(3) Ibid. p. 5.

Delenda Est Carthago(*):

Obviously, the dead-end to which reference has already been made, is based entirely on the concept of *Fait Accompli.* Before we proceed to examine this concept closely, let us ask the following questions:

If your premises are wrong, how can you ever reach correct conclusions?

If the Arab case is morally unanswerable, how can you ever justify the legitimacy of Israel's existence?

This being so, we feel impelled at this stage to anticipate some of the vital conclusions and necessary consequences: It seems clear, and we feel safe in assserting, that Israel's only claim to legitimacy is the right of conquest, the law of the jungle, the principle that might is right and the kind of so-called justice that the stronger imposes on the weaker by naked brute force and sheer material superiority. Thus, the continued, and expanding, existence of Israel is seen through Arab eyes, sustained by the indisputable and ruthless facts of recent history, both as a flagrant affront to and a violation of, human dignity, and as a continued, expantionist and colonizing aggression, posing a dire and direct threat to the very existence

---

(*) The motto of Marcus Porcius Cato, farmer and leader of The Roman Senate in the final stages of the Punic wars between Carthage and Rome (264-133 B.C.). He is said to have ended every speech delivered by him in the senate, whatever the subject, with the words: "Carthage must be destroyed". The Ancient world, by Wallace Everett Caldwell, Rinehart and Company, Incorporated. New York. Twelfth Printing. 1959. p. 377. See Also: Ancient History, by Charles Alexander Robinson. The Macmillan Company. New York. Fourth Printing, 1958. p. 491.

of the Arab Nation. But the Israeli Zionist leaders, intoxicated with the wine of adventure, and dragging their masses along with them, seem to forget that strength and weakness are not eternal and constant facts of history, but relative and variable bonds of life. Today, we posses the might of right, while they posses the right of might. We can, and one day we will, possess the right of might as well. But they cannot, and they will never, posses the might of right. As Pascal said almost three centuries ago, the Arabs realize that: "Justice without force is impotent. Force without justice is tyrannical. We must combine justice with force"(*). Our problem is material. Theirs is moral. The words of the Israeli Zionist leaders ring in Arab ears exactly as the words of the Athenian ambassadors rang in Melian ears more than two thousand years ago. The facts of the Melian dialogue, and their tragic implications, are lucidly and brilliantly summarized and expressed by Prof. Werner Jaeger in the following words: "Melos was a little neutral island (in the Aegean sea), which was overpowered by Athens with her command of the sea (during the Peloponnesian war) ... quite independently of the factual importance of the event, he (Thucydides) uses it to symbolize a general problem and expands his narrative into a masterpiece of political thinking. Here he uses the dialogue from ... to show the two opponents (the Athenian ambassadors and the Melian delegates) parrying argument by argument, question by answer, and to eternalize the painful conflict of might and right

---

(*) Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought From Machiavelli to Hitler. Edited by Edward Mead Earle. Princeton University Press. Princeton, U.S.A., 1948. Third edition. Introduction by E.M. Earle. Page 8. First edition appeared in 1943.

in all its inescapable necessity. (Thus expressing) the conflict of two irreconcilable principles. The brave Melians soon see that they cannot appeal to the Athenians' sense of justice, because the Athenians recognize no standard but their own political advantage. *They therefore try to prove that it is advantageous for Athens to observe some moderation in using her superior power, because the day may come when even Athens will have to appeal to the sense of human decency.* The Athenians, however, unterrified by this warning, explain that their interests compel them to annex the little island, because the world will interpret its continued neutrality as a sign of the weakness of the Athenian empire"(*). Or in the version of what the Athenians said as recorded by Thucydides: "We on our side will use no fine phrases saying, for example, that we have a right to our empire because we defeated the Persians, or that we have come against you now because of the injuries you have done us — a great mass of words that nobody would believe. And we ask you on your side not to imagine that you will influence us by saying that you, though a colony of Sparta, have not joined Sparta in the war, or that you have never done us any harm. Instead we recommend that you should try to get what is possible for you to get, taking into consideration what we both really do think; since you know as well as we do that, when these matters are discussed by practical people, the standard of justice depends on the equality of power to compel and that in fact the strong do what they

(*) Werner Jaeger, Paideia: The Ideals of Greek culture, Vol. I, (Archaic Greece. The Mind of Athens). Book II, chapt. 6. Thucydides: Political Philosopher). Pages 400-401. Basil Blackwell. Oxford. 1954.

have the power to do and the weak accept what they have to accept[1]... Our knowledge of men leads us to conclude that it is a general and necessary law of nature to rule wherever one can. This is not a law that we made ourselves, nor were we the first to act upon it when it was made. We found it already in existence, and we shall leave it to exist for ever among those who come after us. We are merely acting in accordance with it, and we know that you or anybody else with the same power as ours would be acting in precisely the same way"[2].

But this is a comparison with a drastic difference. For despite the great and astonishing similarity between the Israelis and the Athenians in this context, still the Arabs are no Melians, and the second half of the twentieth century is not the fifth century B.C. Now, who on earth, why and by what right, can deny the Arabs their elementary, human and legitimate rights to self-preservation, self-defence and self-determination??... Who, for the love of God, has the cheek to assert that Israel exists on the strength of a morally legitimate claim?... Let the Israeli Zionist leaders ponder on the assertion of Prof. Arnold Toynbee: "The Arabs would, in fact, be almost as difficult to wipe off the map as the Chinese or the Hindus"[3]. They would do themselves, their masses as well as all the nations of the world, a great deal of good, if

(1) Thucydides: The Peloponnesian War. A new translation by Rex Warner. The Penguin Classics. London. First published 1954. Book five. Page 360.

(2) Ibid. Book Five. Page 363.

(3) Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History, The Modern West and The Jews, Vol. 8. Heroic ages. The Oxford University Press. The American edition, 1963. Page 310.

they remember "the historical fact that Carthage was defeated in spite of Hannibal's victories"[1], and if they learn, while there is time, "what so many other conquerors learned before them, that only the final battles decide wars"[2]. Hannibal won all his battles (except the last one), but Carthage lost the war, because she, like Israel, was unable or unwilling or both, to translate her military victories into political gains. Political stupidity and tactical rigidity has always caused the inevitable doom of states, big and small, throughout history.

Let the Israeli Zionist leaders contemplate the words of their old companion, Ben Gurion: "We could win and win again, but if we lose a single battle, then we lose everything. The Arabs could lose and lose again, but if they win a single battle, then they win everything"[3]. Dayan, the Israeli minister of aggression, declared, in the wake of the third Arab-Israeli war of 1967, that he kept himself waiting near his telephone, expecting a call to come from the Arab side to seal a settlement with surrender and submission. But such a call did not come. It will never come. He could have waited till dooms-day without such a call ever coming. The Israelis won a battle in

(1) Hajo Halborn, Chapt. 8, Moltke and Schlieffen: The Prussian — German School. Makers of Modern Strategy. Op. cit., Page 205.

(2) Ibid. Epilogue. Hitler: The Nazi Concept of War. By E.M. Earle. p. 516.

(3) Compare: David Ben-Gurion. Rebirth and Destiny of Israel. Thomas Yoseloff Ltd. London. 1959. p. 265: "...for it is only the final victory that counts, that decides the issue. You may win every battle from the start almost to the finish of war, but if you lose the last you lose all, and your earlier victories are in vain". July 23, 1948.

1967, and they imagined that they have won the war, that they have faught their last war, and that their war of 1967 was the war to end all wars. This is nothing but useless day-dreaming and futile wishful-thinking. Since then, this myth has been exploded and shattered. In this modern punic war, Israel has won many a Cannai[1]. But the Zama[2] of the Arabs has yet to come[3].

Let all thinking women and men read the vivid and illuminating words of Prof. Khalidi: "The Arab attitude in this regard is not based upon nebulous fears or superstition. The Arabs have been at the receiving-end of Zionism. For more than forty years they have suffered from it at first hand. They are entitled to tell the whole world: (we know what we are talking about and you don't. We carry the wounds of Zionism in our soil and our homes, in our limbs and in our hearts)"[4]. A Western student of the Palestine problem, Erskine B. Childers, says the following: "To demand that the victims make peace, while telling the rest of the world —in their hearing— that what was actually done to them simply never happened, is not normally recognized as sound peace-making. In a very real sense, Israel's 'peace offers' are not, by their very nature, directed to the Arabs at all. They are addressed Westwards, to a kind of caricature of the Arabs and of their experience in Palestine; a caricature which Zionism first began de-

(1) The battle in which Hannibal, the Carthagenian leader, defeated the Roman legions. B.C. 216.

(2) The battle in which Scipio Africanus, the Roman leader, defeated Hannibal and conquered Carthage. B.C. 202.

(3) Op. Cit., Page 387.

(4) Prof. Walid Khalidi, Reappraisal, Op. cit., Pages 15-16.

veloping in the West with the assertion that Arab hostility was 'artificial'... In these conditions — the realities of the conflict itself as distinct from the caricature of it — any attempt at a blue-print for a settlement would be a mere paper exercise. I have attempted only to submit that the Western-Israeli thesis for the future ... is on all available evidence as fantasy-founded as past notions. We are beginning to see a new Arab world, dynamic and modernising, confident in its own slowly evolving new ideology and institutions, and conscious of its ancient heritage. It is going to be a world of one hundred million human beings, and its very size and location will make it less and less possible for Western governments to risk all basic interests there in order to maintain a beach-head *status quo* for perhaps three million Israelis. It is going to be a world in which the revolutionary leadership, far from 'giving up' its defenses against Israel and for Palestinians, will feel more strongly and deeply than ever that if the United Nations will not act, the United Arab Nations must do so alone. These, I submit, are the indications. It may be tempting to believe this picture false; but I would urge that if this believed, then in prudence it must be upon some new body of fact and assumption, because every such assumption applied by the West and the Zionists in the past to the future of Palestine has been proved false. It might be pleasing to hope that the Arabs will one day see the fate of Palestine, as Israelis have to, and as Israelis want the West to. *But to hold this hope seems to me to postulate that the Arabs are not human beings*"(*).

(*) Erskine B. Children, Palestine; The broken Triangle. Op. cit., Pages 98-99.

In their hour of adversity and tribulation, the Arabs take a sane, serious and sober look at the words of the British leader, Winston Churchill, when his country, in her finest hour, stood resisting and enduring alone, in the face of painful and unpleasant accomplished facts, and great odds, hoping against hope, and ultimately won. Reviewing the war on October 12, 1942, he said: "When peaceful people who are very careless in peacetime about their defense; carefree, unsuspecting nations, I will say reckless nations, who despised military art and thought war so wicked that it never could happen again—when nations like these are set upon by highly organized and heavily armed conspirators who have been planning in secret over years on end, exalting war as the highest form of human effort, glorifying slaughter and aggression and prepared and trained to the last boundary which science and discipline permit, it is natural that the peaceful and improvident should suffer terribly, and the wicked, scheming aggressors should have their run of savage exultation. That does not end the story. It is only the first chapter. Another chapter would have to be written. It is that chapter which we shall come to in due time... To bring the conjoined, united, irresistible forces of outraged civilization to bear upon the criminals"(*).

The Arab States may say and do what they consider proper, useful or necessary. But how the Arab masses feel and think has been frankly and factually depicted and disclosed. This is their real frame of mind and their true attitude. A moral judgement has not been passed. But rather a living fact has been defined and depicted.

(*)New York Times. October 12, 1942. As quoted by Irving M. Gibson in Makers Of Modern Strategy, Chapt. 15. Maginot and Liddell Hart. Op. cit. Pages 386-387.

Fait Accompli:

We turn now to a close examination of the concept of *Fait Accompli* and the logic of maintaining the *Status quo* indefinitely. Let us first ask the following questions: What is exactly and actualy meant by the statement "Israel is here"? What are the senses, if any, in which it is said? What assumptions and consequences are implied in each of these senses? Are they true and valid or false and unfounded? Do they correspond to or are they sustained by, the facts of life and history, as well as the principles of logic and common sense?

The *fait accompli* concept is expressed in two propositions: The simple proposotion expressed by the factual statement: "Israel is here"; and the more complex proposition expressed by the statement: "Israel is here to stay". The complex proposition has two understones: One prophetic in which the statement: "Israel is here to stay" is nothing but a prophecy, and the other is a threat in which the statement: "Israel is here to stay" means "We want Israel to stay and we will support her against you". Western statements based on, or connected with, the logic of *fait accompli* lead always to the same conclusion. The factual statement: "Israel is here": therefore, you must make peace with her. The prophetic statement: "Israel is here to stay"; therefore you must make peace with her. The threatening statement: "Israel is here to stay, and we will support her against you"; therefore, you must make peace with her. Let us examine each of these propositions separately and successively(*).

Simple Proposition: Factual Statement:

No one disputes the factual statement that "Israel

(*) Prof. Walid Khalidi, Reappraisal, Op. Cit. Page 6.

is now here". Even those who bury their heads in the sand and pretend that Israel does not exist, prove by doing so, that it exists, but that they do not wish to recognize its existence. I do not dispute the factual side of this statement but only the conclusion that we Arabs are asked to derive from it. The conclusion that we must peace with Israel necessarily follows from the fact that Israel exists, only if we make one or more of the following assumptions:

It can follow if we assume that facts as facts have a sancitity of their own, that facts as facts must in practice always be welcomed and embraced. But taking cognizance of facts is one thing, and welcoming and embracing them is something else, entirely and essentially different. The objective actual existence of a fact does not necessarily or logically entail its moral legitimacy or human validity. The conclusion I have stated follows only if we assume that facts as facts must always be welcomed and embraced, irrespective of their nature and antecedents. Such an assumption would make nonsense of human history. The whole course of human history is in one sense a series of rebellions against unpleasant facts. Indeed, history means nothing if human beings may not refuse to accept unpleasant facts. The early American settlers rebelled against the unpleasant fact of British domination. The French revolutionaries rebelled against the unpleasant fact of the *Ancien Regime*. Cavour and Mazzini rebelled against the unpleasant fact of political fragmentation in Italy. Millions of people in Asia and Africa enjoy freedom and independence today because they rebelled against the unpleasant fact of foreign domination. Millions more are still in rebellion against such unpleasant facts(*).

(*) Ibid. Page 8.

Israel from the Arab point of view is a highly unpleasant fact. The Zionists came to Palestine, which is a part of the Arab world, as foreign invaders and expelled the indigenous Arab population by the force of arms. This is a sordid tale which involves untold violence, misery, and wholesale destruction of the entire Arab community in Palestine. Palestine was not a country without a people to be given to a people without a country. The Zionists could not have settled in Palestine without first forcibly expelling the Arabs. If you accept facts because they are facts, what would follow? First, you will have to accept the principle that might is right because it exists, even if it violates justice and is based on naked force. What chaos, what confusion and what disorder would beset the international community? Secondly, this argument, that a fact should be accepted simply because it is a fact, refutes itself. For those who uphold this argument should accept a new accomplished fact when it replaces a previous one. Obviously, this is a self-defeating argument, because a *fait accompli* can always be replaced by another and adverse *fait accompli.*

Why could Britain never accept the German hand of friendship after Dunkirk? Why could America never accept the Japanese hand of friendship after Pearl Harbour? Palestine means to the Arabs drastically much more than what Dunkirk and Pearl Harbour meant to the British and the Americans respectively(*).

In these circumstances why should the Arabs accept Israel merely because it is a *fait accompli* of only 20 years standing, when the Zionists refused to

(*) W. Al-Khalidi, Reappraisal. Op. Cit. p. 11.

accept in Palestine the *fait accompli* of 2,000 years of Arab history and geography?

Complex Proposition: Prophetic And Threatening Undertones.

Having dealt wtih the factual statement that "Israel is here" as a simple proposition, I should like to deal now with the complex statement that "Israel is here to stay" with both its prophetic and threatening undertones.

"There is very little to say about the prophetic undertone. No one can look into the seeds of time and say which shall grow and which shall not. The Near East is in many ways the best vantage point from which to observe the vanity of worldly power and the shifting sands of human fortune. I remember some years ago visiting the Crusader Castle of Deufort. As I stood on the ruined battlements I remember thinking to myself that here I was, a descendant, perhaps of these very people against whom the castle was once built... And as I looked across the valley southwards and saw the concrete towers of the Zionist colony of Metullah only a mile away, there did not rise in my heart a feeling of hatred or of fear, but of hope"[1]. Mr. Nevill Barbour[2] chose once before to answer the statement that 'Israel has come to stay". Many people, he said, admit that Israel should never have been created, that its creation was a mistake and an injustice, but now that she is here, they regard her as irremovable and exhort the Arabs to be "realistic" and accept her as a *"fait accompli"*. He went on to say that in politics and in human affairs no fact is eternal or irremovable,

(1) Ibid. Page 24.

(2) The Author of **Nisi Dominus:** A Survey of the Palestine Controversy. First buplished by George G. Harrap and Co. Ltd., London, 1946. Republished by the Institute For Palestine Studies. Beirut, 1969.

and that in his own lifetime many facts and many institutions which had seemed tremendous and unquestionable realities had passed away — he gave as an example the British Emire into which he had been born, and which as a young man he had regarded as a secure and permanent feature of this world. "But where is the British Empire now? It has disappeared in less than two decades. Israel is far less firmly established, is far less secure and far less powerful than the British Empire ever had been. It surely will pass away eventually under the pressure of sustained Arab opposition, and the realities of the Middle East situation. I want the Arabs to think of such parallels and be encouraged. I would add that Israel has come only fourteen years ago and that to argue from this short ancestry that she must stay is ludicrous when the Arabs had come to Palestine and the countries around it more than 1,300 years ago. If anything has came to stay in the Middle East it is the Arab world and not Israel"[1].

As to the threatening undertone, one can say that the Western governments who mean this phrase to have this connotation are fully entitled to say: "Israel is here to stay because we want her to stay and we will fight for her against you". But having done that, they are not entitled to seek Arab friendship and alliance and try to convince the Arabs of the excellence of the ideas they profess[2].

If it is realistic for the West to expect us Arabs to make peace with Israel, it is equally realistic for us Arabs to expect the West to face the facts of history

---

(1) A direct quotation from a lecture on Palestine Day.

(2) Op. Cit., Pages 24-25.

and the realities of human life, admit that they have been grievously wrong in the past, and overcome their emotional, social and political involvements on the side of Israel in the struggle for Palestine. "If ever the times demanded an agonizing reappraisal of a policy, they now demand, even at this late hour, before it is too late for everybody, an agonizing reappraisal by the Western peoples and powers of Zionism, the Jewish question and the whole concept of Israeli sovereignty"[1].

Doubtful Advantages

The logic of *Fait Accompli,* in all the senses in which it is meant, as we have already seen, leads to the same conclusion: the simple proposition, the factual statement: "Israel is here" therefore, you must make peace with her; the complex proposition in both undertones; the prophetic statement: "Israel is here to stay", therefore you must make peace with her; and the threatening statement: "Israel is here to stay, we want her to stay and we will support her against you", therefore, you must make peace with her. The logic of *Fait Accompli* being based on the fact that Israel exists, leads to the conclusion that the Arabs must make peace with Israel. This argument clearly assumes "that it would be good to the Arabs to make peace with Israel"[2]. Thus the Zionists and their Western friends pretend that there are many advantages which will be to the good of the Arab if they accept a peaceful settlement with Israel. Such is the modern sophistic fallacy, the conclusions of which are stated, while the premises of which are neither discussed nor proved.

(1) Ibid., Page 35.

(2) Khalidi, Reappraisal. Op. Cit. P. 10.

Let us examine this assumption carefully. Is this claim really justified? Is peace with Israel really good to the Arabs? If so, "what is the good that will follow to the Arabs from peace with Israel?"[1]. There are, according to this argument, both immediate and long-term advantages. The immediate advantages that Israel offers to the Arabs in return for peace are as follows: she will concede only minor frontier rectifications and this on a reciprocal basis, she will take back only a token number of refugees; and she will want in return will be a *de facto* recognition and the lifting of the blockade and the boycott[2]. It does not need much imagination to see who will actually benefit most from such a settlement. What are the long-term advantages?"[3].

1— The argument chaims that the Arabs will benefit from Israeli capital and technique. Assuming Arab receptivity (which is absent) the Arabs do not need Israeli capital. The Arabs are less in need for attracting capital from outside than for distributing properly and exploiting rationally the huge capital that they already possess. It is also very doubtful indeed that Israel which lives on foreign and western generosity, has actually surplus capital to invest in large quantities. As for technique, the same can be said. Moreover, the Arabs are seriously training their own technicians everywhere in increasing members. More than 10.000 Arabs are receiving training in technical skills annually both in

(1) Ibid. p. 11.

(2) Ibid pp. 11-12.

(3) Ibid. pp. 12-14.

the Arab world and outside. Besides, the sources of supply for technical skills are not confined to Israel, even if there were a surplus of technical skills in Israel, which is doubtful in the extreme.

2— The argument also claims that peace with Israel will protect the Arabs from Israeli aggressive acts and particularly from her massive reprisal raids. The Arabs think that the best protection against Israeli aggressive expansionism is greater political unity, combined with greater military vigilance and greater diplomatic initiative. Further, long and bitter experience has proved beyond any shred of doubt that peace is nothing to Israel but a temporary truce and a breathing space in which this spearhead of International Zionism prepares to launch a still greater offensive against the Arabs when the opportunity arises. This is the major criticism that the Arabs make to the logic of *Fait Accompli*, particularly to the assumption which is implied in this kind of logic that good to the Arabs can follow from peace with Israel.

Arab Expendability(*):

In the final analysis, this logic is based, as it appears, on two major assumptions: that Zionism is ultimately compatible with Arab Nationalism, therefore, at least they can live side by side in a state of peaceful coexistence, and that Israel as an expression of Zionism, is a final point, a point not of departure but of arrival, that Zionism in fact has realized itself within the present territorial limits of Israel (1964). Only the totally blind or the criminally insane will

(*) Ibid. pp. 15-16.

not see the devastating facts. The Arabs are neither, and therefore they cannot accept these two assumptions. Their attitude in this regard is not based on unfounded fears or irrational expectations. They have been at the receiving end of Zionsm for more than fifty years: They have suffered from it at first hand. They have had direct, both personal and physical, experience of Zionism. They have seen its true face in all its ugliness and barbarism. They are entitled to tell the whole world: "we know what we are talking about and you don't. We carry the wounds of Zionism in our soil and our homes, in our limbs and in our hearts'(*).

At the centre of Zionist philosophy, or better still *weltanshauung,* is the premise of Arab expendability. If the Arab in Zionist eyes had been regarded as a man of equal dignity with the Zionist, the whole structure of military and political Zionism would have tubmled to the ground. Zionism could only live by affirming for the Zionist what was denied to the Arab. Indeed, the very Zionist affirmation which was based on the national home concept led to the total denial of every right to the Arab as was shown by the mass Arab Exodus of 1948. The Zionists have shown a sickening disregard for the dignity of Arab human body, "bordering on the zoological". This attitude produced the large-scale pogroms, the whole-sale massacres and the inhuman blood-baths and ruthless atrocities to which the Arab innocent and unarmed civilians were subjected by the Zionist death squads, murder gangs, and exsecution teams.

(*) Khalidi, Reappraisal. Op. Cit. PP. 15-16.

ZIONIST TERRITORIAL CLAIMS(1)

Let us now ask the pertinent question: has zionism really achieved its final self-realization within the present territorial limits of Israel? Let us look at the aggressive development and the expansionist growth of Israel, as well as at the military and political opportunism of Zionism. Let us throw a quick glance at the Zionist territorial claims in regard to Palestine and the Arab homeland. They started in 1917 with a national home which was less than a state in a part of Palestine. Then they demanded a Jewish state that would comprise the whole of Palestine including the west bank. In the aftermath of the 1967 war, they have gone even further than ever before, and asked for more than just the whole of Palestine. They openly aimed at a Greater Israel, comprising the whole of Palestine, and including vast territories, four times the area of Palestine, belonging to three neibouring independent Arab states, members of the United Nations, namely: the West Bank, the Siniai area, the Gaza Strip and the Golan Hights. They described these territories first as 'occupied' territories, then as 'new' territories and finally as 'liberated' territories(2). Speaking to Israeli youth, General Dayan did not mince his words but told them in no uncertain terms, that his generation accomplished the 1949 borders, that their generation accomplished the 1967 borders, and that future generations would reach still further(3). Ben-Gurion, himself, has always characterized Israel as being a dynamic state that should either expand

(1) Khalidi, Reappraisal. Op. Cit. PP. 18-22.

(2) News-Week. The US Weekly magazine. 25th. December. 1967.

(3) Jerusalem Post. Thursday. August, 10, 1967

or die[1]. In 1956, Israeli forces occupied the Siniai area and the Gaza Strip. Ben-Gurion spoke of this as the "liberation" of that part of the homeland occupied by the invader. Which part of which homeland? He claimed that his forces did not infringe the territory of Egypt, but did liberate part of the Israeli homeland[2]. In the Times[3] of 8th. March, 1964, General Yigal Allon, the present Israeli Deputy Prime Minister, (Now, 1976, Minister of Foreign Affairs) stated that Mr. Ben Gurion is responsible for the Jewish state being as "small" as it is today. He said the following: "When the then premier and defence minister ordered the halt of our army advance we had been on the crest of victory on all vital fronts, from the Litani river in the North to the Siniai desert in the South. A few more days of fighting would have enabled us to crush the invading armies and to liberate

---

(1) See: David Ben-Gurion. Rebirth and Destiny of Israel. Thomas Yoseloff Ltd. London. 1959. (Freedom and Independence, August 13, 1948).

P. 275: "The edifice of the state is unfinished, perchance the fatal battle has still to be fought, our frontiers are undetermined still and undecided, if ever indeed frontiers can be irrevocably fixed".

(The call of spirit In Israel. From the Israel government yearbook, October, 1951). P. 402: "Only now,...have we reached the beginning of independence in a part of our small country".

(Ibid). P. 419: "(To maintain the status quo will not do. We have set up a dynamic state, bent upon...expansion)".

(2) Text of speech by Ben-Gurion in the Knesset on November, 7, 1956, Published in the Zionist London Weekly (the Jewish Observer). Vo. 5, No. 46. November 16, 1956, p. 11.

(3) The famous London daily.

the entire country". We are concerned here with the word "liberate" that he used. We ask: whose was this "entire country" which was being "liberated", and from whom was it being "liberated"? was it a country which the Arabs had forcibly seized from the zionists? were the Arabs alien invaders who had colonized it and who had occupied it against the wishes of its indigenous inhabitants?

More than ten years ago, a book appeared which bore the title (Both Sides Of The Hill: Britain and the Palestine war). A whole chapter, entitled (the battle that remains to be fought), was devoted to a military operation called (shin-Tav-Shin)(*). This operation was said to aim at the occupation of the West Bank of the Jordan River, and the so-called dangerous triangle (Nablus-Tulkarem-Jenin), which threatens like a dagger the thin waist of Israel. This operation was finally accomplished in the 1967 war. The battle that formely remained to be fought, is now already a battle that has been fought. Are we not entitled to ask, and should we not wonder: What other battles that remained to be fought, will one day actually be fought? What other unaccomplished operations are still being preserved in the archives of the Israeli ministry of aggression?

In 1925, the Zionists were a tiny minority in Palestine. In 1956, Israeli armoured units were patrolling the Suez Canal and the Red Sea. In 1967, they were in the Golan Hights and the West Bank as well. From a paper document (which was what the Balfour declaration was in 1917), the national home has already grown into a country which can put more

(*) By Jon and David Kimche. London. Secker and warburg. 1960. pp. 263-272.

than 300,000 armed persons into the field within nearly ninety-six hours, threatening with destruction more than one Arab capital. The Zionists used the Mandatory regime hiding under a British umbrella to acquire a strategic 7 per cent of Palestine. They have squeezed the last drop of benefit from world sympathy for the so-called Jewish war tragedy[1] to get 55 per cent of Palestine with the Partition decision. Finally they made the most of the chaos left by the Mandatory withdrawal in 1948 to get 11 percent of Palestine. Now, they hold the whole of Palestine, plus vast territories, belonging to three independent Arab states, four times as large in area as the whole of Palestine. What Israeli *Fait Accompli* are the Arabs asked to recognize peacefully? What does it comprise and where and when will it stop and end? Such is the Israeli arrogance of power. These are the facts of her expansionist designs and territorial ambitions. Exactly as Europe opposed and fought the German *Lebensraum* of yesterday, so Arabia opposes and fights the Zionist *Lebensraum* of today, tooth and nail.

If Um-Rashrash is called (Elath)[2] in the new Zionist geopolitical termimology, the Gulf of Akabah is called (the Gulf of Solomon)[3], the Island of Tiran is called (Yotvat)[4], and Sharm al-Shaikh is called

---

(1) On the myth of the extermination of 6 million Jews in the Second World War, see: Richard Harwood. Did Six Million Really Die? The Historical Research Press. Richmond, Surrey, U.K. (Undated).

(2) Ben-Gurion. The Jewish Observer. Op. Cit. Rebirth and Destiny of Israel. pp. 304, 310. Israel: Years of challenge, Anthony Blond. London. 1964. PP. 63, 127, 183-184, 197.

(3) Suddeutsche Zeitung. 1/3/1968. In a statement by Levi Eshkol, the Israeli premier then.

(4) Ben Gurion. The Jewish Observer. Op. Cit. Israel: years of challenge. Op. cit. PP. 108, 120.

(Mifraz Shlomo)[1], if all this is so, and it is actually so, are the Arabs not entitled to ask: What other biblical or ancient names are still stored in Zionist memories or entertained in Israeli dreams, to be given to other and numberless Arab cities, villages and territories, when they have "enjoyed the blessings of being liberated by the Israeli armed forces" in due time? What a territorial unsatisfied, and unsatisfiable, hunger! What nightmarish geopolitical, limitless appetite! What cheek! What impudence!

In 1917, the Zionist Norman Bentwich stated the following: "The rabbis compare Palestine to a deer, whose skin grows when it is well fed. So with an increasing population the very area of the land will grow. Nor need Palestine today be confined to its historic borders, and Jewish colonization may extend to the whole territory which was contained in the Promise"[2]. In 1951, the Zionist Menachem Begen reiterated the same theme, only more forcefully, and stated the following: "...Hebrew independence (is) declared in part at least of the country, the whole of which is ours"[3]. His method is crystal-clear and straight-forward: "It is Hebrew arms which decide the boundaries of the Hebrew state. So it is now in this battle, so it will be in the future"[4].

---

(1) Ben-Gurion. As quoted in the Jewish Observer. Op. Cit.

(2) Zionism and the Jewish future. Edited by H. Sacher. London. John Murray. 1917. P. 201. A chapter by Norman Bentwich entitled (The Future of Palestine). pp. 196-209.

(3) Menachem Begen. The Revolt. W.H. Allen. London. 1951. P. 374.

(4) Ibid. p. 376.

Now, these gentlemen are not talking poetry. They did exactly what they said. "It is this undefined and geographically undefinable geopolitical concept of Israel in the minds of zionist leaders which is so ominous for the future"[1].

In the eyes of the Arabs, zionism is *imperialism Par Excellence,* the worst kind of imperialism, the imperialism not of a superimposed administration or of political oppression and economic exploitation, but the imperialism of total displacement and biological extinction[2]. In this context, to fight is to exist. What is the alternative? Shall we make peace with enslavement? Shall we sign and seal our own death? "There is no better means (than the policy of perpetual concessions) of making the opposite party ask for more and more. Every man or every power whose action consists solely in surrender can only finish by self-annihilation. Everything that lives resists; that which does not resist allows itself to be cut up piecemeal"[3]. The Arabs are not the first or the only people in history who refuse to make peace with foreign invaders[4]. Nor are the Zionists the first or the last oppressors and aggressors who refuse to learn the facts of life and the lessons of history. As Arab weakness and fragmentation has been to the advantage of the Zionists in the past, so, rest assured, will Zionist greed and arrogance be to the advantage of the Arabs in the future.

---

(1) Khalidi. Reappraisal Op. Cit. p. 10.

(2) Ibid. p. 22.

(3) Clemenceau. The French Daily **Aurore** of August 15, 1905. As quoted by George Sorel, Refections On Violence. English translation by T.E. Hulme and J. Roth. The Free Press. Glencoe. Illinois. U.S.A. 1950. P. 90.

(4) Op. Cit. P. 10.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

A number of questions were put to Mr. Mushtak at the end of his speech. They and Mr. Mushtak's answers were as follows:

Q- How can the Palestine question be solved now?

A- There are three aspects that should be taken into consideration. First, the Western Powers should attempt an agonizing reappraisal of their attitude to the Palestine question and to Israel and Zionism particularly.

Secondly, the Arabs should apply themselves to the tasks of achieving greater political unity, greater military capability and vigiliance, and greater diplomatic initiatve. They should work harder than ever to achieve progress, power, and prosperity, socially, politically, economically, scientifically, educationally and militarily. As for the Israelis in particular and the Zionists in general, they have four probable alternatives at their disposal: First, they could align themselves completely with the West. This pre-supposes that they will go on pursuing a policy of force that neglects the legitimate rights of the Arabs and ignores their understandable fears. In fact, if the Arabs, according to this alternative, do not give way to Zionist and Israeli demands, they should even be forced to do so. This attitude presupposes Arab weakness as a constant factor in the situation. But history has proved in a practical manner that this is not so. Therefore, this policy is doomed to utter failure from the beginning.

Secondly, the Zionists and Israelis could align themselves completely with the East. But this is a purely theoretical hypothesis which has now become practically impossible. Still, what has been said about the former alternative, can also be said about this alternative: that this policy also has no chance of ever succeeding in historical and grand strategic terms. The third alternative is that the Zionists and Israelis can go on doing what they have done before, and are still doing now. Namely, they can play East against West and *vice versa,* believing misguidedly that they have a civilizing mission, or using this pretext to cover outrightly criminal intentions — treating the Arabs like Redskins, and hoping thus either to preserve the ***status quo*** or force the Arabs to conclude a dictated peace on Zionist and Israeli terms. This policy, once more, is doomed to total and utter failure in the long run. My conviction is that the only correct and lasting solution to both the Palestine question and the Jewish problem in the world is for Zionists and Israelis to renounce Zionism both as a doctrine and a movement, as well as Israeli sovereignty, and to participate actively in the creation of a democratic independent state of Palestine.

Q- Why did the Zionist leaders choose Palestine as the land in which a Jewish state should be established?

A- The leaders of Zionism recognized the religious and emotional ties and sentiments that bind the Jews everywhere to Palestine. They unscrupulously exploited and still exploit these sentimental ties and religious feelings to achieve their selfish and greedy political aims. The Jews of the world, as well as the

Arabs of Palestine, are victims of these shameless and satanic machinations. On the other hand, British imperialist circles, long before the Balfore Declaration and the Palestine Mandate, had recognized the inherent dangers to their interests in a probable future Arab unity. They wanted to drive a wedge between the Arab East and the Arab West, between the people of the Nile and the people of the Euphrates, who are in fact two parts of one and the same Arab nation. Their obective was to divide and rule. The Arabs are still engaged in dismantling and liquidating the last remnants and traces of the Sykes-Picot Agreement, the Palestine Mandate and the Balfour Declaration. Thus, a situation was created in which imperialist interests coincided with Zionist aggressive interests. Both sides worked hand in glove to achieve their common interests. That is how Palestine was chosen as the country in which a Jewish state was to be established at the cost of forcibly expelling more than a million indigenous Arabs from their country. Further, Arabia, extending from the Ocean to the Gulf, is the heart of the world, in geopolitical terms, economically, geographically and strategically. The heart of Arabia is composed of three parts, culturally, historically and physically: Egypt. Syria and Iraq. And the heart of this heart, so to speak, is Palestine. Dominate Palestine, and you will dominate Arabia. Dominate Arabia, and you will dominate the world.

The timing of the establishment of the state of Israel in 1948. was devilishly perfect, locally in Palestine, regionally in the Arab area, and internationally in the whole world. Locally, the British forces had levelled to the ground all centres of Arab opposition and resistance in Palestine, since the great rebellion

of 1936. Regionally, the Arabs were weak, divided and opporessed by local lackeys of British and western Imperialism. Internationally, the Western Allies—the sponsors of Israel—had ust won the War against Nazi Germany, and the Zionists had been so clever and unscrupulous in exploiting for their political ends the feelings of horror and of profound human sympathy which the myth of anti-Jewish Nazi atrocities had provoked in the world, that they succeeded in creating a psychological reign of terror and blackmail against anyone in Britain or America who dared say a word of criticism against Zionism or the project of a Jewish state in Palestine, with the result that nobody dared make such criticism for fear of being labelled "fascist", "nazi", "anti-semitic".

How else could Israel have been established except in the situation which thus prevailed in 1948, and how could it have been established except by direct partisan and partial US pressure and sheer western military preponderance, in the local, regional and International circumstances which then existed?

CHAPTER TWO

EXODUS

The Arab Exodus 1948-1949

How and Why did the Palestinian Arabs Leave Their Country?(1)

Mr. Hazim Mustak, Press Attache at this Embassy, delivered a lecture at the London University Students' Union on the evening of 16th. November, 1964. He was invited to do so by the Arab Students' Society. The audience was large, mixed and included some Zionists, non-Zionist Jews and many British and Arab students. The lecture was received warmly and some British Jews supported Mr. Mushtak's contentions in opposition to Zionist allegations.

In the course of his lecture., Mr. Mushtak gratefully and proudly acknowledged his great debt to two prominent scholars, on the question of the Arab exodus of 1948-49 and how the Palestinian Arabs left their country. Mr. Erskine Childers[2], a western scholar of outstanding integrity and sincerity, and Prof. Walid Khalidi[3], an Arab scholar of unquestionable objecti-

---

(1) Reporduced from the issue of **the Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq in London, January/February 1965, Page 34. Printed by Stephen Austin & Sons, Ltd., Hartford, Herts, Eng.

(2) Erskine Childers. **The Other Exodus,** The Spectator, London, May 18, 1961. Reprinted: (Palestine: collected papers). The Arab cultural Club. Beirut. 1963. pp. 78-82. Also, **Palestine: The Broken Triangle,** Journal of International Affairs, Vol. 19, No. 1, 1965, Col. Univ. N.Y.

(3) Prof. Walid Khalidi, **Why did the Palestinians Leave? An Examination of the Zionist Version of the Exodus of 1948.** The Arab Information Centre, London. Undated.

vity and authority. Both have arrived independently through painstaking research at the same conclusions, unmasking Zionist distortions, allegations, and untruths, once and for all.

We publish below, excerpts from Mr. Mushtak's lecture:

Zionist and Israeli official propaganda, particularly in western countries, has disguised the causes and consequences of expelling by force more than 1,000,000 Arabs from their homes in 1948-49. But how could Palestine, in the words of Weizman, be made "as Jewish as England is English"[1], if the Zionists did not first frocibly expel the Arabs who were the majority of the indigenous inhabitants, and displace them by foreign immigrants and colonial settlers, thus creating an artificial and alien Zionist majority?[2] How

(1) Chaim Weizmann. Trial And Error. East And West Library. London. 1950. Page 305. "Mr. Lansing, the American Secretary of State (at the peace conference, a few months after the First World War), called me over and asked me: 'What do you mean by a Jewish National Home?'...I defined the Jewish National Home to mean the creation of an administration which would arise out of the natural contitions of the country...with the hope that by Jewish immigration, Palestine would ultimately become as Jewish as England is English". But this idea was in his mind all the time. There is an earlier expression, though moulded differently: "Palestine will be the country in which Jews are to be found, just as Ireland is the country in which Irishmen are to be found...". Chaim Weizmann, Zionism And The Jewish Problem, A Contribution found in **Zionism And The Jewish Future,** By various writers, Edited by H. Sacher. Published by John Murray, London, 1917. Page 8.

(2) See note (1) at the end of this chapter.

could a Jewish state have been established in the Arab homeland having at the same time a large and effective Arab minority or an actual Arab majority?[1] From the very beginning the Arab inhabitants feared that the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine would lead to their expulsion and displacement by Zionist immigrants. But time and again the British mandatory authorities tried to allay these fears by official assurances that the rights and interests of the Arab inhabitants of Palestine would not be harmed but protected. Events have proved beyond any doubt that Arab fears were legitimate and far-sighted, while British assurances were shameless and hypocritical[2].

Lord Boothby, a British statesman of considerable prestige and a pro-Zionist at that, asserted that this was exactly what the Zionists had intended to do from the very beginning. He was supported in this assertion by a letter he received from no other person than Mrs. Weizmann herself. Furthermore, let us remined the British and western peoples that the Zionist terrorist organization "Irgun" waged an indiscriminate warfare against unarmed Arab civilians, with the implicit knowledge and approval of the High Command of the official Israeli defence forces "Haganah". Begen, the head of that terrorist group and the present leader of the second largest Israeli political party "Herut", admits openly in his book *The Revolt* that their aim was to force the Arabs into flight out of fear. The vicious massacres of 'Dayr-Yasin' where all the civilian inhabitants including men, women and children were indiscriminately put to the sword, is only one of many

(1) See note (2) at the end of this chapter.

(2) See note (3) at the end of this chapter.

examples[1].

Official Israeli and Zionist propaganda claims that they never sought to displace or deprive the Arabs of Palestine; that, but for the machinations of a few unscrupulous Arab politicians, there would never have been a conflict between the Zionists and the Arabs; that the Zionist authorities implored Palestinian Arabs to stay, but failed because Arab leaders ordered the civilians to leave and evacuate[2]. This tragic joke would be completed, in the words of Mr. Erskine Childers whom I am quoting, "If Messrs. Ben Gurion and Levi Eshkol someday announce that there really never were all those Arabs in Palestine; that there has been a frightful mistake; that the ones now called Arab refugees were actually visiting tourists when the war of 1948 broke out"[3].

Let us further complete the picture. In 1939 the British Government isued a White Paper limiting the number of Zionist immigrants allowed to enter into Palestine. Zionist motto at that time was, "To fight the war as if there was no White Paper and to fight the White Paper as if there was no war"[4]. This meant that they fought the Germans in Europe to get the Jews out and both the British and the Arabs to get the Jews into Palestine. During the later stages of the war, Zionist terrorists in Palestine kidnapped, publicly flogged and summarily executed British

(1) Menachem Begen, The Revolt, published by W.H. Allen and Co., Ltd. London, 1951. Pages 162-164.

(2) See note (4) at the end of this chapter.

(3) A direct quotation which appeared in the **Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq. London. Jan./Feb. 1965., Vol. 6., No. 1., P. 36. Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons Ltd., Hertford, Herts, England.

(4) David Ben Gurion, Israel: Years of Challenge, Published by Anthony Blond, London, 1964, Page 16.

judges, British officials, and British officers as well as Arab civilians. The assassination of Lord Moyne[1], the British resident minister in the Middle East, during the war years in Cairo by Zionist terrorists, is only one of many such examples. Zionist propaganda theme at that time was abundance; there was enough land in Palestine, enough water, and enough everything to accommodate and absorb both Jewish immigrants and Arab inhabitants in limitless numbers. Their aim was to get Jewish immigrants into Palestine. Zionist propoganda theme is now shortage. The land is small and barely enough; water is scarce. Their aim now, having forcibly expelled the indigenous Arab inhabitants, is to keep them permanently out of Palestine[2]. All this is ominous; having stolen unjustly some land and some water that did not belong to them originally, their intention is to steal still more land and more water. May I ask how can they refuse to permit a million Arab refugees to return to their original homes in Palestine, claiming that the country cannot economically absorb them, when at the same time they open their doors to more than one million foreign immigrants to enter into and settle in Palestine? Is this consistent or just?[3].

How And Why did It Happen?

A corner-stone of Zionist propaganda, as I have already said, has been the charge that the Palestine Arabs left their homes in 1948 in obedience to orders they received from their leaders. This charge has been

(1) Menachem Begen, The Revolt, Published by W.H. Allen & Co., Ltd., London, 1951. Pages 145-150.

(2) See note (5) at the end of this chapter.

(3) See note (6) at the end of this chapter.

part of a general campaign to undermine world sympathy for the terrible plight of the Palestine Arab refugees. We owe all this comprehension of the real causes and consequences of the Arab exodus to the admirable, painstaking, and intelligent research done by Mr. Walid Khalidi whom I am quoting in this context. He asserts that starting with Herzel, Zionists have always recognized one fact: that they have to get the Arabs out of Palestine before they could comfortably install themselves. The forcible expulsion of more than one million Palestinian Arabs from their original homes was a premediated Zionist policy executed with singular ruthlessness. Painstaking research shows conclusively and irrefutably that no such orders were ever broadcast, published or given[1]. Yet the Zionists persist in making such a claim. Why? They do so because they realize that the problem of Arab refugees is touching the conscience of the civilized world. Thus they decided to counter the damaging influence it has on their cause. This is a skilful propaganda tactic with manifold purposes; "it shifts the moral responsibility for the refugees on to the Arabs themselves; it absolves the Zionists from such a responsibility by pinning it on the Arabs themselves, putting them on the defensive and shouldering them with the burden of proof. Above all it directs the attention from the primary to the derivative; from the actual cause of events in 1948 in Palestine to the realm of patience-consuming allegation and counter-allegation"[2]. Not one shred of concrete evidence has been produced by the Zionists! not one broadcast or publi-

---

(1) See note (7) at the end of this chapter.

(2) W. Al-Khalidi. Why Did The Palestinians Leave? Op. Cit., P. 32.

cation has been specified. Nor could any such evidence be found because it simply never existed. On the contrary, all Arab official leaders and responsible bodies implored and indeed ordered Palestinian Arabs to bear with patience the brunt of the Zionist military and psychological offensive, and stay at their lands, villages and homes. There is ample evidence supporting this assertion in the monitoring reports of the B.BC., in the dispatches of foreign correspondents at the time, and in both Zionist and Arab Press as well as radio stations[2]. This is what Zionist propagandists call a calculated policy sponsored by the Arab League to evacuate the Arabs of Palestine as part of a carefully worked out strategy to facilitate the entry of the Arab regular armies. There you have it. This is the truth: the Arab exodus was not caused by the entry of the Arab regular armies. On the contrary, the entry of the Arab regular armies was caused by the Arab exodus and by the inhuman terrible massacres committed by Zionist gangsters against unarmed or poorly armed Arab civilians[2].

The Zionist grand strategic plan aiming at the conquest of the whole of Palestine was divided into various strategic phases and tactical moves, and it was called "Plan Dalet". "The ideological premises of this plan are to be found in the very concept of Zionism. The nineteenth-century Zionists of Eastern Europe share characteristics with many other nationalists of the time. But unlike the other nationalist movements, Zionism did not then possess a land it could call its own. The other nationalists were basically trying either to

(1) See note (8) at the end of this chapter.

(2) Khalidi. Op. Cit., P. 7.

break away territorially from a foreign ruling power or to extract greater concessions in their own territories from such powers. The land that the Zionists were looking for was one which they wanted to posses and unmistakably stamp with their own image. But what if this land was already possessed by and belonged to others?"[1] Palestine was not a country without a people to be given to a cocktail of nations, a Babel of peoples, who were without a country. Crimes committed by others against Jews in Europe can never be redeemed by similar crimes committed by Zionists against Arabs in Palestine.

"The basic features of the situation in Palestine in 1948-49 were as follows from the power point of view: as between the Jews and the Arabs of Palestine, the former unquestionably possessed overwhelming and superior power. The Arab strength lay, however, in the fact that they were *in situ*, they were already on the land and they had been there for 2,000 years. To be defeated the Arabs had to be dislodged, and dislodged they had to be, if the Zionists were to get the state "given" them by the U.N. For the U.N. partition decision of November 1947, passed by direct and partisan pressure, did not consecrate the existing *status quo* in Palestine. On the contrary, the partition decision was a revolutionary decision to effect a radical and unjust territorial redistribution in favour of the Zionists at the expense of the Arabs. To succeed, the Zionists had to revolutionize the *status quo*, and action, initiative and offence were therefore the *sine qua non* for the realization of the Zionist objectives"[2]. I now

(1) Ibid. P. 33.

(2) Ibid. P. 38. The Partition Decision gave the Zionists, who held less than seven per cent of Palestine, about fifty-five per cent of the country.

ask again who was the defender and who was the aggressor, the indigenous Arabs or the invading Zionists? The verdict of history is clear and irrefutable. I have already explained how the Zionists succeeded in expelling by force the indigenous Arab inhabitants of Palestine from their original homes and dispossessed them of all their worldly belongings. They accomplished all this by inhuman and unjst means before the termination of the British mandate in Palestine, before the withdrawal of the British forces from Palestine and before the entry of the Arab regular armies into Palestine. The Zionists depended in their success on British help, assistance, and protection, without which they would have definitely failed.

NOTES

1— See: Michael Ionides, Divide And Lose (The Arab Revolt of 1955-1958). Geoffrey Bles. London. 1960, P. 52: "It would mean that national self-determination had been withheld when the Arabs were a majority in Palestine and only conceded when the Jews were a majority".

2— See: Erskine B. Childers, The other Exodus, The Spectator. Op. Cit. P. 82: "The Jewish state envisaged by the UN would have contained a 45 per cent Arab population: the extra territory attacked by the Zionists before May 14 would have increased that ratio, for example, by more than 80,000 Arabs in Jaffa alone. But it was not just a question of numbers. The Arabs owned and occupied far too much of the territory's productive and social facilities to enable anything like the mass Jewish immigration of which Zionists dreamed. What this meant in terms of motive can be seen in the statistics that followed the Arab Exodus. More than 80 per cent of the entire land area of Israel is land abandoned by the Arab refugees... It is, then, little wonder that old Chaim Weizman, Israel's first president, described the Arab Exodus as: "a miraculous simplification of Israel's tasks". "But was it 'miraculous?' Unexpected? In no way a part of combined military and economic planning of nascent Israel's leaders?".

3— See: Ionides. Divide And lose. Op. Cit. p. 13: "... the true purpose of political Zionism was proved by the establishment of Israel and the

expulsion of three-quarters of a million Arabs in 1948... The Arabs had always said that this would happen, but for decades they had been assured, by the Zionists and British governments alike, that they had nothing to fear".

See also: Arnold J. Toynbee, A Study of History. Vol. 8. Heroic Ages. Contacts Between Civilizations in Space.

P. 290, N. 2: "While the direct responsibility for this calamity that overtook the Palestinian Arabs in A.D. 1948 was on the heads of Zionist Jews who seized a *Lebensraum* for themselves in Palestine by force of arms in that year, a heavy load of indirect, yet irrepudiable, responsibility was on the heads of the people of the United Kingdom; for the Jews would not have had in A.D. 1948 the opportunity to conquer an Arab country in which they had amounted to no more than an inconsiderable minority in A.D. 1918 if, during the intervening thirty years, the power of the United Kingdom had not been exerted continuously to make possible the entry of Jewish immigrants into Palestine contrary to the will, despite of the protests, and without regard to the forebodings of Arab inhabitants of the country who in A.D. 1948 were duly to become the victims of this long pursued British policy.".

See also in the same source, the sub-chapter entitled (Great Britains' Responsibility For The Catastrophe In Palestine), pp. 303-306. p. 304: "The Western Power that bore the lion's share in the responsibility for the interwar failure to

retrieve the position in Palestine was Great Britain, who, first as occupying power and then as mandatory, was conducting the administration of Palestine from A.D. 1917 to A.D. 1948".

P. 306: "...It could be predicted with assurance after A.D. 1915, and with double assurance after A.D. 1922, that the mandatory regime in Palestine would end in the death or eviction or subjection of hundreds of thousands of human beings... It was incontestable that, during the thirty years ending in the terminal date of the British mandatory regime in A.D. 1948, the... Jewish immigrants introduced into Palestine in the course of that period entered the country by the might of England against the will of the people, who were convinced that these had come to strangle them; and the event proved that this British action did in truth mean the Palestinian Arabs' extinction sooner or later...".

4— See: Erskine B. Childers. The Other Exodus, op. cit. pp. 78-79.

5— See: Michael Ionides, Divide and Lose (the Arab revolt of 1955-1958). Geoffrey Bles. London. 1960. Page 83: "The 'fact' of abundance had proved the right of Jews to immigrate. Now it was time to go into reverse; no longer abundance, but shortage. The Jews would need all they had got and more. There was not enough land, not enough water. That proved that the Arab refugees ought to move on elsewhere. It proved in particular that they had no right to expect to go back to their homes... The myth of abundance had justified the Jews coming in. The truth of shortage justified keeping the Arab

refugees out. A book by Dr. Walter Clay Lowdermilk, entitled (Palestine: Land of Promise. Collancz. 1946). included this short sentence: (Palestine is after all only a very small part of the large area sparsely occupied by the Arab race). This was to be the basis of the new line of Zionist propaganda".

6— See: Ionides. Divide And Lose. Op. Cit. P. 79: "Now the Israelis had plans for diverting the water out of the Jordan valley and into the coastal plain to irrigate their own lands to make room for more immigrants. Having taken the lands the Arab refugees had formerly lived on, irrigation waters which were now the only hope for the refugees were to be taken from them, diverted upstream. Who had a better claim to these waters, Arabs whose lands were now occupied by Jews, or Jewish immigrants of the future who had not yet even set foot on Israel?".

7— See: Childers. The Other Exodus. op. cit. pp. 78-80. Also; Khalidi. Why Did The Palestinians Leave? op. cit. pp. 2-4.

8— See: Childers Op. Cit. pp. 79-80.
Also: Khalidi. Op. Cit. pp. 5-6.

CHAPTER THREE

TRIANGLE

PALESTINE DAY IN LONDON ON 15th MAY 1965(*)

The Arab Students' Union in the United Kingdom and Ireland commemorated 'Palestine Day' by holding a meeting on 15th May 1965 at the Mayfair Hall in London. The conference was attended by an audience of about 500, which included diplomatic representatives of Arab countries, British writers, journalists, and experts on Middle Eastern affairs, Asians, Africans as well as Arab workers and students. If the audience was impressive in size, so was the platform in quality; Mr. Hazim Mushtak, Press Attaché at the Embassy of Iraq in London, and Mr. Erskine Childers, the well-known writer and broadcaster, and one of the foremost authorities in Britain on Arab affairs in general and the Palestine question in particular.

As on previous occasions, the object of the meeting was to demonstrate as eloquently and effectively as possible that the Arabs had not forgotten and would not forget that Palestine was their country, no matter how many years might pass since they lost it, no matter how many Palestine Days might come and go before they regained it. Those who may hope that the Arabs will forget Palestine or ultimately accept its loss would do well to ponder the fact that many of the Palestinian and other Arab students who organized

(*) Reproduced from the issue of the **Buleetin** of the Republic of Iraq in London of May/June 1965, page 8. Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons, Ltd. Hertford, Herts, England.

this year's Palestine Day Meeting were children of ten or less when Palestine was lost, but are as determined to pursue the struggle for its liberation as the students who at the time were politically conscious young men.

Erskine Childers

Mr. Erskine Childers began his speech—as he rightly does on all such occasion—by making his position *vis-a-vis* the Jewish question crystal-clear, by emphasizing that he is not, and has never been, anti-semitic, that his opposition to Zionism is entirely a political opposition to a wrongfull and disasterous political act, regardless of the race or relgion of those who perpetrate it; and that indeed, as a Westerner and a British socialist he feels a two-fold shame — shame for the abominal persecution of the Jews under Nazi Germany(*), and shame for the wrong done to the Arabs in Palestine, for the attempt by the West to make amends to the Jews of Europe by inflicting a grievous injustice on the Arabs who have never wronged the Jews, as wel as shame, being a British socialist, for the one-sided, partial, and unfair attitude of the British Labour Government *vis-a-vis* Arab Palestine in total violation of their socialist ethics and declared principles opposing racial discrimination and supporting human

(*) On this occasion in the year 1965, the myth of the extermination of six million Jews by the Germans in the Second World War, had not yet conclusively and finally been exposed and unmasked. This has recently been done by Richard E. Harwood in his scholarly work entitled **(Did Six Million Rearlly Die? The Truth At Last).** Published by The Historical Review Press, Richmond, Surrey, U.K. (A note inserted by the author on March 18, 1976).

dignity and equality. He spoke of an article which appeared in a Zionist paper in Israel and dealt with him, his support for Arab Palestine and opposition to Israel and Zionism. The paper had asserted that one of his ancestors was a prominent Jew. The Zionists have made long, careful, and painstaking research on his racial ancestry. Mr. Childers declared that the only other case of which he knows and in which such a thing was possible is the case of Nazi Germany which the Zionists claim to have opposed and resisted. Mr. Childers further reminded the audience that all his conclusions are not based on a single Arab or even neutral source, but entirely on Zionist and Israeli sources. He stressed that unfortunately the Western states no longer take heed of moral values and humanitarian principles. The freedom of the Arabs in general and the liberation of Palestine in particular depends on the development and consolidation of the Arabs' national power in the political, economic, and military spheres. He criticized the policy of the British Labour Government which opposes racial discrimination in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa but condones the very same situation in Zionism and Israel. The only hope for a reconsideration and reappraisal by the Western countries of their attitude to Palestine and the Arabs depends on the emergence of a united Arab power.

If the Western countries do not respect justice on the moral level, they surely respect power on the pragmatic level. The Arabs have right on their side, and they are going increasingly to have might as well.

Elsewhere in this issue of *the Bulletin*, we have published the speech of Mr. Hazim Mushtak. The conference was concluded by adopting unanimously resolutions supporting Arab Palestine and condemning Zionism and Israel.

ARAB NATIONALISM, WESTERN IMPERIALISM AND INTERNATIONAL ZIONISM: FACT AND FICTION(*)

Tribute to Edward Atiyah

Sixteen years have passed since the crime was committed of imposing the State of Israel by force of arms on Arabia, at the expense of inhumanly expelling more than a million indigenous Palestinian Arabs from their homeland, Arab Palestine, and dispossessing them of all their wordly belongings. Year after year, a dear friend of ours stood on this platform and appealed to the British sense of justice and fairness on behalf of Arab Palestine. I am speaking of Edward Atiyah who passed away on the evening of Thursday, 22nd October 1964, while speaking in support of a motion, "That this House supports Arab intereference with Israeli trade", at the Oxford Union Society debate. I would like on this occasion to pay tribute to his personal integrity, moral courage and intellectual fortitude. Ancient Arab warriors were never congratulated on their living or consoled on their dead. A man was, or was not, a credit to his nation and to mankind. Let Arabs and their friends rejoice that one of their kind was a man like Edward Atiyah. Ancient Greek worriors preserved their military honour only when they returned from the battlefield carrying their shields in their hands, or when their dead bodies were returned home carried on their shields.

(*) Reproduced from the issue of the **Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq in London, of May/June 1965, page 12. (A Lecture delivered by Hazim T. Mushtak on Palestine Day in London)), Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons Ltd., Hertford, Herts, England.

Their greatest disgrace was to surrender their shields to the enemy and return home alive. Edward Atiyah did not surrender his shield to the enemy. He returned home from his last battle carried on his shield in full honour. I find no better way to commemorate him than unamsking the ugly reality of Israel and the false pretences of Zionism(*).

"ARABIA": Yesterday and Today

When I use the term "Arabia", I do not have in mind the meaning which ancient Greek and Roman historians and geographers had in mind when they used the terms *"Arabia Felix"*, *"Arabia Petraea"*, and *"Arabia Deserta"*. Nor am I using this term in the sense used by the more recent western romantic Arabists like Stanhope, Doughty, and Lawrence. But I have in mind the Arabia of the present generation of young Arabs, extending from Tangier to Aden, bound together by ties of language and history, forming a single community of historic culture and national identity.

ISRAEL: Fait Accompli and Status Quo

Some misguided or misinformed Western voices are raised advising the Arabs to accept the *fait accompli*, the *status quo* and the existence of Israel. We are told that Israel is here and that Israel is here

---

(*) The late Edward Atiyah is the author of several novels and books: The Arabs, A Penguin publication, 1955. Also, An Arab Tells His Story. See the special issue of the Bulletin of the Republic of Iraq (Nov./Dec. 1694. Vol. 5 No. 2.) dedicated to him. Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons. Ltd.. Hertford, Herts, England. Editor: Hazim T. Mushtak.

to stay either as a matter of fact, or as a prophecy or as a threat. In each case, we are asked to make peace with Israel on Zionist terms.

Fact and Conclusion

No one disputes the factual statements that Israel is now here. I dispute not the fact but the conclusion that we Arabs are asked to derive from this fact. The conclusion that we must make peace with Israel follows from the fact of Israel's existence only if one or more of the following assumptions is made: Peace with Israel follows if we assume that facts as facts have a sanctity of their own and must in practice always be welcomed and embraced. Cognizance of facts is one thing. Welcoming and embracing them is another entirely different thing. The whole course of human history would become reduced to nonsense if facts are accepted regardless of their nature and antecendents. History means nothing if human beings are not free in refusing to accept unpleasant or superfluous facts. This rebellion against unpleasant facts or unjust realities explains the American revolution, the French revolution and every great momentous. and decisive event in human history. There is no fact more unpleasant from the Arab point of view than the fact of Israel's existence. Why did Britain never accept the German hand of friendship after Dunkirk? Why did America never accept the Japanese hand of friendship after Pearl Harbour? Palestine is to the Arabs more than what Dunkirk and Pearl Harbour were to the British and Americans respectively. Was there a greater accomplished fact as far as this country was concerned than the German presence on the shores of France and the German occupation of the whole of Europe? Why did Britain not accept the European *status quo* in 1940 when she was alone and single-handed in her finest

hour resisting German domination and Nazi Power? was there a greater and clearer *Fait Accompli* in South East Asia in 1941 than the fall of Singapore, the Japanese presence on the borders of India and the Japanese threat to the shores of Australia? Yet America persisted in her resistance and continued to fight. Why should the Arabs accept Israel merely because it is a *fait accompli* of only fifteen years standing, when the Zionists had refused to accept the *fait accompli* of 2,000 years of Arab history and geography in Palestine? We shall never falter, flag or fail. We shall never submit to the logic of force. We shall defend the cause of freedom, right and justice to the end. History proves that the cause of justice, supported by the united strength of a determined nation, can, must and will win in the end, sooner or later.

Prophecy

There are again those who say that Israel is here and that Israel is here to stay as a statement of prophecy, meaning that Israel exists now and will surely continue to exist in the future. Who are we to say which of the seeds of time shall go and which shall stay, which shall live, and which shall die? The Near East is the best vantage point from which to observe the vanity of worldly power and the shifting sands of human fortune. Stand on the ruined battlements of crusader castles in Arab villages and glance at the concrete towers of Zionist colonies in occupied Palestine, and, being an Arab, you will have not a feeling of fear or hate but a feeling of hope. No fact is eternal or irremovable in politics and in human affairs. Many facts and many institutions which seemed at one time tremendous and unquestionable realities have passed away. The British Empire was

once upon a time regarded as a secure and permanent feature of this world. But where is the British Empire now? It has disappeared in less than two decades. Israel is far less firmly established, is far less secure, far less powerful than the British Empire had ever been. Arabs think of such parallels and are not dismayed but encouraged. Surely, if anything has come to stay in the Middle East it is not Israel but Arabia.

Threat

There are those, finally, who say that Israel is here and that Israel is here to stay as a statement of threat. Western governments who mean this phrase to have this connotation are fully entitled to say: "Israel is here to stay because we want her to stay and we will fight for her against you". But having done that, they are not entitled to seek Arab friendship and alliance and exert hopeless efforts in trying to convince the Arabs of the excellence of Western ideas and ideals.

Will The West Ever Awake?

Let me ask you, Ladies and Gentlemen; Why do I say all this?

Zionists cannot continue to live, facing the rising tide of Arab social nationalism, without the persistent and unreserved support of the Western countries. The moods, reactions, and fluctuations of public opinion are often important and sometimes decisive in shaping the politics of these countries. To win the sympathy and the support of these countries, Zionists are forced to keep the Western peoples in utter ignorance of the facts of the situation in the Arab homeland. Zionists thrive on the ignorance of the Western peoples. Zionists deliberately falsify facts and keep Western peoples in ignorance. Zionist vested interests, pressure groups, and propaganda organs in Britain and throughout the West, surround the Arab Palestine

cause with thick clouds of planned distortion and deliberate ambiguity. In doing so they do not hesitate to endanger the security requirements and the vital interests of these very same Western countries, the citizenship and prosperity of which they continue to enjoy fully and freely, though ungratefully and thanklessly.

The Arabs deduce their own conclusions and take the necessary consequent measures, when they find all kinds of West German, American and British arms paraded through the streets of occupied Palestine on Zionist official occasions. Arab-Western relations are deteriorating rapidly and moving quickly down the slope to frontal confrontation. When will the West awake? If falsehood is the constant ally of the Zionists, truth is the best friend of the Arabs. Let the Western peoples take heed before it is too late of the grave dangers and the dire consequences involved in the policies persued by their governments in Arabia. Let the fair-minded and peace-loving British and Western peoples ask themselves the following questions: What price Israel? Shall we submit passively and endlessly to the reign of terror and deceit exercised by Zionist vested interests, pressure groups, and propaganda organs? Is it wise or right to endanger or violate our global security, moral principles, and vital interests by adopting a partial, one-sided and unfair attitude in the Arab-Israeli conflict? How far and for how long are we going to continue to support this anachronistic and artificial state of Israel? What kind of a state is Israel? Is it a special kind of state? A super-state? A state above other states and beyond reproach and criticism? The Western governments and peoples can afford to ignore these vital problems and questions and indulge in wishful-thinking and day-dreaming only at their own exepense and risk.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESURGENCE

ARABIA REBORN(*)

A GREAT PAST AND A GREATER FUTURE

OUR NATIONAL REVOLUTION IS SOCIALIST

Man is born twice in one lifetime: first physically and then spiritually. The latter kind of birth involves greater agony and hardship than the former. I was born spiritually on the 15th May 1948 amidst historical shame, profound pain and sacred hatred. This is true of a whole generation of Arab rebels, young, dedicated and selfless Arab nationalists, socialists and unionists who have condemned the *status quo* and the *fait accompli* since then as void and null. I asked myself: who am I? Thus I asked myself: who are we? And finally I asked myself: were we defeated? If so, why? And do we deserve to suffer the inhuman ordeal and the flagrant injustice that was imposed on us? Thus started a process of self-criticism, of agonizing but realistic reappraisal of Arab social structuree and national being. There is nothing wrong or shameful in a nation suffering a setback by losing one battle in a long war. To loose is to accept, submit and surrender. This is the real, final defeat. To win is to reject,

---

(*) This lecture was delivered by Hazim T. Mushtak at **Palestine Day Conefrence** on 15th May 1966 in London. Reproduced from **Palestine Day Conference 1966.** Published by the Genreal Union of Arab Students in the United Kingdom & Ireland. Printed in England by E.T. Heron & Co. Ltd. Essex & London, Pages 23-26. Other speakers on the Rostrum included Mr. Tom Little, a leading British writer and author of many books on Arab affairs, Mr. Tahseen Basheer, then of the Arab League Information Office in London, and now the official spokesman of the Arab Republic of Egypt, as well as Mr. Erskine Childers.

resist and fight. This is the real, impregnable victory. Arabism stands erect, proud and confident, challenging fate, because her will to live, to change and to resist has never been conquered.

Some conservative, traditional and reactionary Arabs may try to explain that all the setbacks and injustices we have suffered are pre-ordained by God. But this is a cheap attempt to falsify reality. God has nothing to do with our suffering and shame. This is the doing of our internal enemies who have aligned themselves with our external enemies. God would wish for the Arab nation what the Arab nation would wish for itself. If we do not determine our destiny by ourselves it will be determined by foreign interests and imperialistic powers.

There are again some Arabs who would think that all the dangers that threaten us and all the evils that inflict us are engineered solely by foreign imperialism and international Zionism. This is a wrong assessment and a mistaken view. Our external enemies are unable to creat a situation that has no actual foundation in our life or instigate a disruption that does not actually have some basis in our society. They are however ready to exploit an inner weakness, a hidden evil or a spontaneous disintegration in such a way as to benefit themselves and harm us. No greater danger exists to the Arab nation than its internal enemies and the continuation of the *ancient regime* and the traditional society that still lingers in some parts of the Arab homeland despite having been condemned and exposed by the Palestinian catastrophe as inherently and totally brankrupt and useless.

No danger poses a greater threat to the very existence of the Arab nation than its own national fragmentation and internal weakness. The strength of

the enemy is derived to a great extent from our own weakness. We intend to underestimate neither. A realistic, dispassionate and objective appraisal of our situation demands a frank and cruel confrontation of our contemporary society and national revolution. We have confronted ourselves long ago. This has been one of the greatest achievements of the Arab socialist national revolution. But the confrontation of social reality is a different matter. The same set of facts may produce conflicting attitudes and different actions. It is one thing to confront reality through acceptance, surrender and submission. It is another entirely different thing to confront reality by resistance, rejection and active transformation. If we glance at the general course of human history, and study the causes of the genesis and the nemesis of nations and cultures, we will find that both may die more often than not by committing suicide than by being murdered(*).

The only *raison d'etre* of political action in our Arab part of the world is to investigate the causes and consequences of the Palestinian catastrophe and thereby to determine the proper theoretical foundations of our national life and the correct courses of collective action. The real causes of our decline and fall in Palestine are not the proximate causes. The real causes are the ultimate causes that have been at work through a long historical process. Conservative reactionaries are trying to dope Arab masses by claiming that the consequences of defeat were determined in 1948 by purely political and military considerations. They imply that the old system is basically sound and healthy

(*) See the note at the end of this chapter: (On the Nemesis of Cultures, States and Nations, which the author has recently added, while preparing his lectures to appear in a printed and published form.

and that the catastrophe was the result of minor aberrations that can be rectified while the social edifice remains essentially intact. Their aim is to prolong the life of the old system that caused the catastrophe and preserve its basic tenets and the foundations of its rotten structure. We progressive revolutionary Arab nationalists and socialists assert to the masses of our Arab people that a whole way of life in Arabia was condemned to death by the catastrophe in 1948. We reject the *ancient regime* in all its forms and maniefestations; moral, spiritual and cultural as wel as economic, social and political. *The problem we face is not a problem within the system. It is the problem of the system as a whole.* We reject not only the old concept of what is good but also the old concept of what is bad. We reject not only the old governments but also the old official ways of opposition to these governments: The borgeois, Democratic, liberal and parliamentary methods. The champions of sweet reason and political moderation have done everything they can for forty years and we have reaped only waekness, injustice and shame. The continuation of the *ancient regime* means the prolongation of the causes in our body politic that produced the catastrophe, and therefore, means the possibility of repetition and recurrence of the catastrophe of Arab Palestine in other parts of the Arab homeland. Human cultures do not appear and advance where life is easy, water is plenty and soil is rich. Human cultures appear and advance where a continuous, decisive challenge exists. A blow that might kill a senile might only awaken a youth. Arabia is now awake and reborn. A body politic may suffer two kinds of illness: One resembles a case of tuberculosis and the other resembles a plague. The former is difficult to diagnose in its early stages. When its

symptoms appear clearly in the later stages the illness would have passed the possibility of cure or treatment and would surely kill. A plague, on the other hand, strikes suddenly nad violently, and therefore cure or treatment is possible. This is the kind of blessing in disguise that the Palestinian catastrophe offers to the Arab nation. Arab reactionary, traditional and conservative elements recognise that their continued existence depends on the continued existence of Zionist occupation and imperialist presence on Arab soil. This is the basis of the unholy alliance that binds reaction, Zionism and Imperialism in the Arab world and the Middle East. Israel lives through the prolongation of Arab backwardness and the preservation of Arab fragmentation. In the beginning Zionism behaved as if no Arabs existed in Palestine, as if Palestine was an empty country to be populated by Zionist foreign immigrants and European settlers. But the Arabs asserted themselves and brought their existence to the notice of the world through acts of resistence, violence and terrorism. A continuous state of Arab revolt existed in Palestine between 1917 and 1948 against both the imperial power and its Zionist *protégé*. Events proved that Arab fears of Zionist racialism were legitimate and far-sighted. But British official assurances and promises were worthless and forlorn. The Zionists claim that the war was engineered by Arab reactionaries and feudalists to divert the attention of the Arab masses from their pressing internal problems and difficulties. This myth is exposed by the fact that the socialist revolution in the Arab homeland did not diminish but intensified Arab hostility towards Israel. Now Zionist propaganda claims that only time will heal the wounds and solve the problems. Let us assure these misguided gentlemen

that young Arabs who assemble today and raise their fists in defiance of Israel were children when Israel was created in 1948. Twenty seven years have passed since Israel was created. Our determination has grown stronger not weaker. Far from being a factor of stability, peace and progress in the Middle East, the creation of Israel was the main cause of restlessness, turmoil and instability. The revolutions that have swept the Arab soil far and wide are witness to this fact. Nothing has harmed British and Western vital interests in the Arab world more than the creation and the continued existence of Israel. Greater harm to these vital interests is still to come. A new way of and outlook to life is emerging slowly and perhaps painfully, but surely, in the Arab homeland. To discard old knowledge is always more difficult than to acquire new knowledge. Arabs have to forget a little old knowledge that they may learn a great deal that is new and vital. The restlessness, the turmoil and the instability which we witness in Arabia now are the death-pangs of a world that is dying out of existence and the birth-labours of a new world that is coming to life. Faithful and loyal unto death to our reborn Arab nationalism, to our beloved Arab nation and socialist Revolution, we stand firm and march united to eliminate social injustice, abolish the exploitation of man by man in the Arab homeland and defeat reaction, imperialism and Israel.

Blessed are those who have already fallen and those who will yet fall that Arabia may live in Unity, Freedom and Progressive Nationalist Socialism.

ON THE NEMESIS

OF

CULTURES, STATES AND NATIONS

Latent forces in the very inner being of nations cause them to rise or fall. It is a grave delusion to suppose that military defeats, economic disasters and political turmoils lead to the disintegration, the decline and the death of states. Where the destinies of cultures, states and nations are involved, and successfully determined, there you will find that causes and consequences are clearly distinguished and distinctly apprehended. A political malady is similar, by nature, in this sense, to a medical malady.

If a political body is ill, treating the symptoms only, will not necessarily ensure a final cure. A confusion in this respect, entails not only a theoretical mistake, but also, and often, a practical disaster. The causes of the nemesis of cultures, states and nations are the real not the apparent, the ultimate not the proximate, and the internal not the external causes. The political, military and economic defects, defeats and disasters. are merely expressions, consequences and results of deeper and more profound historical forces, causes and trends. See the following authors and sources:

1. Arnold J. Toynbee. A study of History. The Oxford University Press. 1962. Vol. 4. (The Breakdowns of civilizations). p. 115:

"... We find that, out of the nineteen remaining civilizations, no less than sixteen prove to have broken down through their own acts, before even any alien human force succeeded in dealing them a potentially mortal blow. In all these cases the most that the alien enemy has achieved has been to give the expiring

suicide his *coup de grace* or to devour his carcass after it has already become carrion". The blow is self-inflicted, although "The original breakdown, as well as the last act of decline and fall, wears the appearance of being the work of alien hand...". Toynbee concludes: "on this showing, we may fairly conclude the the cause of the breakdown of civilizations is not to be found in a loss of command over the human environment, as measured by the successful encroachment of alien forces upon the life of any given society whose breakdown we may be attempting to investigate".

Also, vol. 8. 1963. p. 88: "Indeed, the historical evidence that has presented itself in our empirical survey of breakdowns has seemed to warrant the conclusion that the breakdown of a civilization is invariably due to some inward failure of self-determination and never due to blows delivered by external agencies". This is how Pitrim A. Sorokin understands the verdict of Toynbee that *"civilizations perish through suicide but not murder"*. See the essay by Sorkin entitled (Toynbee's philosophy of History). pp. 174-175. in (Toynbee And History: Critical Essays And Reviews). Edited by M.F. Ashley Montaqu, Published by Porter Sargent, Boston. U.S.A. 1956. pp. 172-190.

2. Gustave Le Bon. The crowd: A study Of The Popular Mind. T. Fisher Unwin Ltd. London. Therteenth Impression. 1921. First translated 1876.

PP. 13-14: "The Great upheavals which precede changes of civilization, such as the fall of the Roman Empire and the foundation of the Arabian Empire, seem at first sight determined more especially by political transformations, foreign invasions, or the overthrow of dynasties. But a more attentive study of these events shows that behind their apparent

causes the real cause is generally seen to be a profound modification in the ideas of the peoples. The true historical upheavals are not those which astonish us by their grandeur and violence. The only important changes when the renewal of civilizations results, affect ideas, conceptions, and beliefs. The memorable events of history are the visible effects of the invisible changes of human thought".

PP. 18-19: "History tells us, that from the moment when the moral forces on which a civilization rested have lost their strength, its final dissolution is brought about... A civilization involves fixed rules, discipline, a passing from the instinctive to the rational state, forethought for the future, an elevated degree of culture...".

PP. 67-68: "When studying in a preceding work the part played by ideas in the evolution of nations, we showed that every civilization is the outcome of a small number of fundamental ideas... Finally we saw that great historical perturbations are the result, as a rule, of changes in these fundamental ideas".

PP. 236-239: "If we examine in their main lines the genesis of the greatness and of the fall of the civilizations that preceded our own, what do we see? At the dawn of civilization a swarm of men of various origins, brought together by the chances of migrations, invasions, and conquests. Of different blood, and of equally different languages and beliefs, the only common bond of union between these men is the half-recognised law of a chief... Nothing is stable in connection with them. They are barbarians. At length time accomplishes its work. The identity of surroundings, the repeated intermingling of races, the necessities of life in common exert their influence. The assemblage of

dissimilar units begins to blend into a whole, to form a race: that is, an aggregate possessing common characteristics and sentiments... The crowd has become a people, and this people is able to emerge from its barbarous state. However, it will only entirely emerge therefrom when, after long efforts, struggles necessarily repeated, and innumerable recommencements, it shall have acquired an ideal. The nature of this ideal is of slight importance; whether it be the cult of Rome, the might of Athens, or the triumph of Allah, it will suffice to endow all the individuals of the race that is forming with perfect unity of sentiment and thought. At this stage a new civilization, with its institutions, its beliefs, and its arts, may be born. In pursuit of its ideal, the race will acquire in succession the qualities necessary to give it splendour, vigour, and grandeur... After having exerted its creative action, time begins that work of destruction from which neither gods nor men escape. Having reached a certain level of strength and complexity a civilization ceases to grow, and having ceased to grow it is condemned to a speedy decline. The hour of its old age has struck. This inevitable hour is always marked by the weakening of the ideal that was the mainstay of the race. In proportion as this ideal pales all the relegious, political, and social structures inspired by it begin to be shaken. With the progressive perishing of its ideal the race loses more and more the qualities that lent it its cohesion, its unity, and its strength...what constituted a people, a unity, a whole, becomes in the end an agglomeration of individualities lacking cohesion, and artificially held together for a time by its traditions and institutions...with the definite loss of its old ideal the genius of the race entirely disappears; it is

a mere swarm of isolated individuals and returns to its original state — that of a crowd. Without consistency and without a future... Its civilization is now without stability, and at the mercy of every chance... The civilization may still seem brilliant because it posseses an outward form, the work of a long past, but it is in reality an edifice crumbling to ruin, which nothing supports, and destined to fall in at the first storm. To pass in pursuit of an ideal from the barbarous to the civilised state, and then when this ideal has lost its virtue, to decline and die, such is the cycle of the life of a people".

The auther begs to differ. Nations may often sleep. But they do not die or disappear. Their spirit remains dormant. And when conditions are ripe, they rise again, like a seed that grows through layers of soil and dust, to embrace the light of the sun.

See also: G. Le Bon. The Psychology of Revolution. Translated into English by Bernard Miall. Putnam. New York. 1913. P. 54: *"Governments are not overthrown; instead, they commit suicide"*.

3. Ollivier. L'Empire Liberal. Vol. 16. P. 1.: "Study of the facts in history has led me to this experimental conclusion: that no government was ever overthrown by its enemies... *There is only one way for a government to die: Suicide"*. As quaoted by Vifredo Pareto. The Mind And Society: A Treatise On General Sociology. Translated by Arthur Livingston and Andrew Bongiorno. Dover Publications. New York. 1963. Vol. 2. p. 1540. Note No. 1.

4. Edward Gibbon. The Decline And Fall Of The Roman Empire. The Great Books. The University of Chicago. The Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1952.

Vol. 1. chapt. 7, P. 79:

"Since Rumulus, with a small band of shepherds and outlaws, fortified himself on the hills near the Tiber, ten centuries had already elapsed. During the first four ages, the Romans, in the laborious school of poverty, had acquired the virtues of war and government; by the vigorous exertion of those virtues, and by the assistance of fortune, they had obtained, in the course of the three succeeding centuries, an absolute empire over many countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. The last three hundred years had been consumed in *apparent prosperity and internal decline*(*). The nation of soldiers, magistrates, and legislators, who composed the thirty-five tribes of the Roman people, was dissolved into the common mass of mankind and confounded with the millions of servile provincials, *who received the name without adopting the spirit of the Romans....* the limits of the Roman empire still extended from the Western Ocean to the Tigris, and from mount Atlas to the Rhine and the Danube... The *form was still the same, but the animating health and rigour were fled.* The industry of the people was discouraged and exhausted by a long series of oppression. The discipline of the legions, which alone, after the extinction of every other virtue, had propped the greatness of the state, was corrupted by the ambition, or relaxed by the weakness, of the emperors. The strength of the frontiers, which had always consisted in arms rather than in fortifications, was insensibly undermined, and the fairest provinces were left exposed to the rapaciousness or ambition of the barabarians, who soon discovered the decline of the Roman Empire".

(*) All italics are mine — the Author.

Vol. 2. chapt. 71.

P. 592:

"The crowd of writers of every nation, who impute the destruction of the Roman monuments to the Goths and the Christians, have neglected to enquire how far they were animated by a hostile principle, and how far they possessed the means and the leisure to satiate their enmity...*But in simple truth, the Northern conquerors were neither sufficiently savage, nor sufficiently refined, to entertain such aspiring ideas of destruction and revenge*".

P. 594:

"I have reserved for the last the most potent and forcible cause of destruction, the domestic hostilities of the Romans themselves".

P. 595:

"In comparing the 'days' of foreign with the ages of domestic hostility, we must pronounce that the latter have been far more ruinous to the city...".

Thus Toynbee, Le Bon, and Gibbon, on the nemesis of cultures, states, and nations.

CHAPTER FIVE

IDENTITY

ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM:

TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN(*)

1— ISRAEL: A COLONIAL ANACHRONISM. ZIONIST ANTI-COLONIAL FALSE PRETENCES.

2— ANTI-ZIONISTS: EVER, ANTI-SEMITICS: NEVER.

3— ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM: TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN.

4— ISRAEL: TALKS PEACE AND WAGES WAR.

5— PEACE WITH ZULUS.

(*) A Lecture Delivered by Hazim T. Mushtak on **Palestine Day Conference,** London, 14th May, 1967. (Hitherto Unpublished).

1— ISRAEL: A COLONIAL ANACHRONISM.

ZIONIST ANTI-COLONIAL FALES PRETENCES:

The *Guardian* of 1st August, 1964, had this to say, and I quote; "Israelis sometimes make a similar claim of anti-colonialism. They too asserted their independence against the British colonial power, but theirs too was a settlers' revolt. Zionism was, in fact, the last successful surge of European colonialism into alien territory". Thus *The Guardian* exposed the fallacy of the Zionists' truly astonishing pretentions of anti-colonialism — pretentions which have given Israel a sort of forged passport to the sympathy of certain states. Like every other argument by which Zionism, and now the State of Israel, tried to white-wash themselves and justify what they did in Palestine, this is not merely a distortion of the truth, but a complete and precise reversal of it. Far from being a subject colonial people who struggled for their freedom against British colonial rule, the Zionists in Palestine were a creation of colonialism. They were imposed on Arab Palestine as colonizers by a colonial power. And their colonization was the most terrible from of colonization for the native population, and in the eyes of the Arabs it is colonialism *Par excellence,* for it meant the forcible settlement in their country of an alien people coming with the intention of possessing the land permanently and eventually dominating or kicking out the native population. There has only been one anti-colonial struggle in Palestine. It is that which was waged by the Arab population under the Mandate from 1918 to 1948, against both the Zionist colonizers and the British imperial power that was helping them. It is still being waged by the Palestine Arabs both from outside Palestine and, as reports indicate, from within, by the Arab population of Israel

— a population first reduced to a minority in its own country and then treated as a second class minority subject to military oppression and racial disrimination. From this population, a resistance movement has emerged and has become serious enough for the Israeli authorities in occupied Arab Palestine to take notice of it.

2— ANTI-ZIONISTS: EVER, ANTI-SEMITICS: NEVER.

The Arabs are not opposed to individual Jews, nor to groups of Jewish human beings, and certainly not to Judaism; a great world-religion which they revere and respect. But they are opposed to Zionism. The problem is political, neither religious nor racial. Throughout their history, the Arabs have never practised or condoned racial discrimination or religious persecution. An Arab is brown, black or white; is Jew, Christian or Moslem. There have never been ghettos or programs anywhere in Arabia. The so-called Gas chambers, and concentration camps, are European and not Arab inventions.

The Arab-Israeli conflict is a conflict between the indigenous Arab population, and those whom they consider as European settlers and foreign invaders who encroached on their peaceful life and dispossessed them of their country by force under the protection of mandatory and imperialist umbrella. Zionists claim that Jews are "returning" to their promised land which was theirs 2000 years ago. The western peoples are deliberately kept in ignorance of what happened in Palestine, the Middle-East, and the Arab world in those 2000 years. To the Arabs who have been living there in the past 2000 years, this "returning" looks like conquering. Zionists never tire of saying and repeating that Israel is defending herself and that the Arabs are the aggressors. Let us ask: who is the aggressor

and who is the defender? The original indigenous Arabs of Palestine, defending their lives, homes and rights, or the Zionist European settlers and foreign invaders who came armed from head to toe, expelling, massacring and dispossessing the indigenous population of Arab Palestine? What kind of a state is Israel? Is it a special kind of state? A super state? A state above other states and beyond reproach and criticism? George Ionides says the following in his book *Divide and Lose:* "A great deal of what I say may be unfamiliar to British and western peoples and unwelcome to some. But Israel and the Zionists must expect, like any other state or movement their political activities noted and discussed openly. They have no right to expect Jews or gentiles to continue indefinitely to shrink from political ciriticism of Zionist political activities for fear of being accused of anti-semitism"(*).

Let us remember that two wrongs do not make a right. The Arabs, innocent of any crimes racial or religious against the Jews, were victimized by Western and Zionist powers to redeem crimes committed by European gentiles against European Jews in European countries.

If the thief happens to be by chance a Jew and the owner of the house a Gentile, or as in this case, an Arab, should the latter be accused of anti-semitism because he resists the former?... Arab Palestine could have been forcibly seized and the indigenous population violently expelled by the Senegalese, or the Algerians, or any group of people for that matter, and they still would have been resisted by the indigenous Arab population of Palestine. The race or religion of the aggressor has nothing to do with the resistance of

(*) Michael Ionides, **Divide and Lose:** The Arab Revolt of 1955-1958. Published by Geoffrey Bles Ltd., London, 1960. The Preface, Page 6.

the victim to aggression.

The Arabs resent, reject and resist the Israeli regime of Zionist racial discrimination and white supremacy in Palestine and other Israeli occupied Arab territories, in the same way that they resent, reject and resist the regimes of racial discrimination and white supremacy in Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. By defending their national existence, the Arabs are also defending human dignity and international justice. Deplorable crimes against the Jews in Europe can never be redeemed by similar Zionist and Israeli crimes against Arabs in Palestine. This was asserted publicly time and again by the British internationaly-renouned historian, Arnold Toynbee.

3— ZIONISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM: TWO SIDES OF THE SAME COIN:

Let the fair-minded and freedom-loving people ask themselves the following questions: Are the premises of Zionism really valid? Is Israel really the solution to the Jewish problem in the world? Is Zionism the correct answer to anti-semitism?

There was a Jewish problem in the world long before the creation of Israel. There is still a Jewish problem in the world more than twenty years after the creation of Israel. There will always be a Jewish problem in the world so long as it is not solved collectively and internationally on liberal, democratic and humanitarian grounds, by treating the Jews in every country as free citizens with equal rights and obligations. Far from being a final solution to the Jewish problem in the world, Zionism, and particularly Israel, has added to the burden of anti-semitism which the whole world shoulders, the complex of dual identity and divided loyalty of which the Jew now suffers. Zionism has aggrevated the Jewish problem in the

world and has not solved it. It did not solve it, nor will it ever be able to solve it. Zionism does not want a humane and just solution to the Jewish problem in the world. Anti-semitism is the *raison d'etre* and the *sine qua non* of Zionism. Anti-semitism is the pre-requisite necessary minimum condition of Zionism. Anti-semitism and Zionism are two sides of the same coin. Would Zionism or Israel have come into being or exist today if the Jews were assimilated instead of being persecuted? Zionism is the single last surviving relic of the intellectual climate of a bygone European era — the anti-rational and romantic *milieu* of the late 19th century and the early 20th century of European history — born and nourished in a cultural atmosphere full of missionary zeal, mythical civilizing spirit, totalitarian frame of mind and aggressive expantionist attitude. How much longer and how much further can this doctrine and movement continue to resist the irresistable winds of historical change before mankind places it deservingly in the dust-bin of history?

Zionism and anti-semitism are distinctly European events that appeared in distinctly European conditions and circumstances; both are fundamentally and totally alien to Arab Nationalism and Arab history.

4— ISRAEL: TALKS PEACE AND WAGES WAR:

Some misguided, or misinformed, or even evil voices are raised accusing the Arabs of adopting a purely negative attitude, while hinting at the same time that the Arabs should take the initiative and suggest some positive settlement. Let us remind these gentlemen regardless of their motives that the burden of suggesting a settlement does not fall on the Arab Nationalists but on the international Zionists. We did not attack Palestine. We did not colonize Palestine.

We did not displace the indigenous population by force of arms. Palestine is our home and our country. We have been living in Palestine peacefully in the past 2000 years until the Zionist foreign invaders and European settlers attacked us seizing our country forcibly and expelling us ruthlessly. This has become a fact of history which no amount of propaganda can hide, distort or twist.

No thinking human being can fail to see now that the Zionists are paying a verbal tribute to peace while actually waging a war of aggrandizement and aggression. If the Arabs resist, they are savages, who understand only the language of force, and Israel will teach them a needed and necessary lesson which they will never forget. If they submitt, they are cowards who deserve what they get. They should have no chance either way. This is the diabolic stance of the Zionist anti-Arab propaganda in the West. Thus George Ionides desribed, superbly and lucidly, in his book entitled (Divide And Lose), how Jewish action appears defensive but actually is offensive, and how Arab action appears offensive but actually is defensive: "In literal terms, the Zionists were steadily changing Arab-owned land into Jewish-owned land and steadily increasing the Jewish population. The Arabs were on the defensive against this continual movement. There could hardly be a case to which the word 'defensive' applies more exactly... The initiative in firing the first shot must always lie with the Arabs, and this would be an offensive action... Arab action, although of an essentially defensive nature, therefore always appeared to be offensive...and Zionist action, which was of an offensive nature in terms of Arab interests, always appeared as defensive"(*). Further: "If Arabs sold their

(*) Ionides, Divide And Lose. Ibid. P. 45.

land to Jews, that proved that the Arabs were corrupt, that they only thought of monetary gain, and that Arab opposition must therefore be inspired by unworthy, contemptible motives and that it ought to be brushed aside. If on the contrary Arabs refused to sell their land to the Jews, that showed that they were (disobedient and that they should be obliged and forced) to do so. If the Arab population was tranquil, that proved that all was well and that they had no serious objection to Zionist immigration. If they agitated, demonstrated or revolted, then they were endangering the security of the realm, seeking to frustrate the legal purpose and obligation of the Mandate, and threatening imperial communications. When agitation or revolts subsided, that proved that feeling could not be very deep, for otherwise the agitation would surely have continued. While agitation or revolt was in progress it would be wrong to yield, for that would be appeasement; when agitation had ceased or subsided it could be said that the disorders had been put down with that firmness which all Arabs respect, and that it would now be wrong and unnecessary to make any concessions lest that should encourage further demands. If the Arabs were violent, that showed there savage nature and they deserved all they got; if they just talked but did nothing, that showed they had no guts and deserved all they got"(*). The western press attacked the Arabs both ways: "It was morally wicked of them to fight to prevent the Zionists enjoying what was theirs, they were weak and incompetent to fight and fail. As aggressors they had no right to win; for their military incompetence they deserved to lose. They should have been loyal to the United Nations' decision to partition, for the rule of law must be

(*) Ibid. p. 55.

honoured; they must accept the consequences of defeat, for victory goes to those who are strong. The Jews were there as of right; anyway, they had beaten the Arabs in war. It was right for the Jews to fight to acquire; wrong for the Arabs to fight to hold"[1].

In short, International Zionism adopted the following, simple but satanic, anti-Arab line of propaganda, in the west:

"The refugees had evactuated of their own free will, under instruction from their own leaders. It was their own silly fault; they deserved all they had got. Alternatively, the Arabs had wickedly tried to invade the new state of Israel and had lost through a combination of cowardice and incompetence; they deserved all they had got. It was the old familiar twin-line adjusted to the new circumstances. If the Arabs submitted, that showed their unworthiness, if they resisted, that showed their savagery"[2]. Basically and essentially, this is, in fact, the Israeli Zionist approach to the problem of Arab Palestine. Unless they bet on the irrational, the unrealistic and the impossible, the Arabs have a single solitary alternative at their disposal. One door, and one door only, remains open to them: violent, military resistance, and direct, offensive action. This is their elementary human right to self-defense and self determination[3]. In all modesty, let the international community suggest a better alternative.

It does not need much inagination to see that Israel, despite all her verbal protestations, does not

---

(1) Ibid. p. 79.

(2) Ibid. pp. 82-83.

(3) Article 51 of the UN charter.

fulfil one single condition of a genuine and lasting peace, and is not prepared to do so at any time in the future. All these international, historical or religious pretexts of Zionism are sheer nonesense. Israel exists and continues to exist on one account and on one account only: The law of the jungle, the logic of naked force and the principle that might is right—assisted to some degree by the preservation of Arab fragementation and the prolongation of Arab backwardness through the unohyl alliance between Arab reactionaries and Western Imperialists. This is the broken triangle of which Mr. Erskine spoke so often[1]. The Arab indigenous population of Palestine has never been consulted on the fate of their country. Their very national existence was consistently denied and ruthlessly supressed.

5— PEACE WITH ZULUS:

In the April 1964 issue of the Chatham house publication, "International Affairs", there is a chapter entitled "The Arab-Israel conflict: Some suggested solutions" by Yigal Allon, the present Deputy Prime Minister of Israel and formerly chief of staff of the Israeli Army[2], offering, as the title professes, peace to

(1) Erskine B. Childers, Palestine: The Broken Traingle. The Journal of International Affairs, Columbia University, New York. 1965. Vol. 19, No. 1, P. 91: "The Palestine conflict is and always has been a triangular confrontation of the West, The Zionists and the Arabs; but one in which the only real, or 'two-way' dialoque has been on the Western-Zionist side. It began, however, on a single axis entirely within the Western world—the axis of dialogue between Western Gentiles and Western Zionists".

(2) Presently, in 1976, the Minister of Foreign Affairs.

the Arabs. In this chapter he says unblushingly:

"If the Arab States are really afraid that Israel is too small to absorb the many immigrants who are without homes and without any future to look forward to in the countries from which they come, why do they seek to limit her even more by hinting at territorial concessions at Israel's expense?"(*). This is sheer nonesense and useless sophistry. General Allon proves not only that he is a fine soldier qualified in military affairs, but also a perfect professional in linguistic acrobatics, juggling with words. He is either over-estimating the intelligence of the Israelis, or under-estimating the intelligence of the Arabs as well as all other human beings. This is rather revealing, significant and expressive.

In that masterpiece of humour and irony, "1066 And all that", there is a chapter entitled "The Zulu War", which goes like this: War with Zulus: Zulus Exterminated: Peace with Zulus. This is exactly the kind of false peace and real war that Mr. Allon offers to the Arabs on behalf of the Zionists: War with the Arabs: The Arabs exterminated: peace with the Arabs.

If the reader substitutes "Arabs" for "Zulus" in the foregoing paragraph he will have (for truth can be stranger than the most fantastic fiction or ironical whimsy) a true idea of what this peace offer actually means. The Arab population of Palestine was, if not etxerminated in the sense of being put to death, at least evicted from its country and therefore extermi-

---

(*) Yigal Allon, The Arab-Israel conflect: Some suggested solutions. International Affairs: A quarterly Review. Chatham House. Vol. 40. No. 2. P. 211.

nated as a political entity in it. The peace which Mr. Allon sugests now is to be on the basis of the recognition of this political extermination. For the Israeli deputy prime minister is categorical in refusing to recognize the rights of the Palestinian Arabs to return to their homes. It is, therefore, not with them that Israel is prepared to make peace since, like the Zulus, they have been entirely eliminated from the picture. In fact the only concession that Israel offers in these "peace proposals" is some doubtful, symbolic compensation to the Arab refugees on condition they be settled in other parts of the Arab world. No regard whatever is shown for Arab feelings or for indisputable Arab rights supported by overwhelming majorities at the United Nations. Moreover these proposals are presented in a spirit and with comments on the Arab people and what they hold as dear, precious and sacred in life, impossible to associate with anyone genuinely wishing to make peace with them. The article, with its glib professions and protestations, is addressed to liberal opinion in the West with the object of impressing it with Israel's peaceful intentions, and may succeed in deceiving those to whom it is addressed. But it is not addressed to the Arabs, and will certainly not deceive them.

ARNOLD TOYNBEE: ON NAZIS, ZIONISTS, AND ARABS

The modern tragedy of Palestine has been placed in its true perspective by Arnold Toynbee, the contemporary British historian of considerable prestige and international fame. We publish below some quotations from his monumental work entitled "A Study of History".

Discussing History and Human Nature, he explicitly declares: "of all the sombre ironies of history none throws a more sinister light on human nature than the fact that the new-sytle nationalist Jews, on the morrow of the most appalling of the many persecutions that their race had endured, should at once proceed to demonstrate, at the expense of Palestinian Arabs whose only offence against the Jews was that Palestine was their ancestral home, that the lesson learnt by Zionists from the sufferings which Nazis had inflicted on Jews was, not to forbear from committing the crime of which they themselves had been the victims, but to presecute, in their turn, a people weaker than they were"(*).

Speaking of Western-Zionist unholy collaboration, and their consequent forcible violation of Arab Palestine, he had the following to say with exemplary fortitude:

"...and a retrospect of this chapter of these Arab countries' history would lend colour to the veiw that their weakness had been ruthlessly exploited by modern Western politicians to solve Western problems at the Arabs' expense...on the same cynical principle

---

(*) Arnold Toynbee, **A Study of History.** Vols. 7-10. P. 177. An Abridgement by Dr. D.C. Somervell. The Oxford Univ. Press, London, 1957.

of making the defenceless pay, the Zionists on the 14th May, 1948, had set up a state of Israel in Palestine by force of arms in a war that had resulted in more than half a million Palestinian Arabs losing their homes, in compensation for atrocities committed against Jews in A.D. 1933-45, not in the Levant, but in Europe, and not by Arabs, but by Germans... By a similar operation of psychological forces the Zionists obtained a retrospective condonation from the United Nations Organization for their violation of the rights of the Arab People of Palestine... An impartial non-Western observers' verdict would assuredly have been that, however grievously the Western peoples might have sinned against one another and against the Jewish stranger in their midst, and however desirable it might be that they should make atonement at their own expense, there was neither merit nor justice in their compensating their victims at the expense of innocent third parties. As against Zionist and Western aggressors, the Arabs had an unanswerable moral case..."(*).

Comparing the Zionist apprentice to the Nazi master, in a unique and revealing historical perspective, Toynbee passed unhesitatingly his considered and thoughtful judgement:

"But the Nazi Gentiles' fall was less tragic than the Zionist Jews'. On the morrow of a persecution in Europe in which they had been the victims of the worst atrocities ever known to have been suffered by Jews or indeed by any other human beings, the Jews' immediate reaction to their own experience was to be-

(*) Arnold J. Toynbee. **A Study of History.** Vol. 8. Heroic Ages. Contacts Between Civilizations In Space (Encounters Between Contemporaries). The Oxford University Press. London. Printed in the U.S.A., 1963. pp. 258-259.

come persecutors in their turn for the first time since A.D. 135 - and this at the first opportunity that has arisen for them to inflict on other human beings who had done the Jews no injury, but who happened to be weaker than they were, some of the wrongs and sufferings that had been inflicted on the Jews by their many successive Western Centile presecutors during the intervening seventeen centuries... The Jews had even less excuse in A.D. 1948 for evicting Palestinian Arabs from their homes than Nabuchadnezzar and Titus and Hadrian and the Spanish and Portuguese inquisition had for uprooting, persecuting, and exterminating Jews in Palestine and elsewhere at diverse times in the past. In A.D. 1948 the Jews knew, from personal experience, what they were doing, and it was their supreme tragedy that the lesson learnt by them from their encounter with the Nazi Gentiles should have been not to eschew but to imitate some of the evil deeds that the Nazis had committed against the Jews ...The evil deeds commited by the Zionist Jews against the Palestinian Arabs that were comparable to crimes committed against the Jews by the Nazis were the massacre of men, women, and children at Deir Yasin on 19th April, 1948"[1].

But this is not all. Toynbee asserted, further, that the biological extinction of the Arabs as a race and a nation is a physical impossibility: "The Arabs would, in fact, be almost as difficult to wipe off the map as the Chinese or the Hindus"[2]. Their violent reaction to the Zionist international anachronism and the Israeli aggressive expansionism is a legitimate measure of self-defense and a natural expression of the will to live. The Zionist and Israeli leaders should have known better than

(1) Ibid., pp. 289-290.

(2) Ibid., p. 310.

to expect something different. They are either brainless fools or heedless criminals: "The assaulted body social's resistance to the painful and disruptive intrusion of alien culture-elements can be taken as a matter of course"[1]. The Israelis have won many battles without winning a final victory. Their (Cannae)[2] belongs to the past. The Arabs have lost many battles without suffering a final defeat. Their (Zama)[3] belongs to the future. How many wars can Israel hope to win? What fate will Israel suffer if and when she suffers a single defeat? "war is a relation which is technologically educative in spite of being psychologically estranging"[4]. Strength is a relative matter, not a permanent fact of history. Arab weakness is not a lasting global feature. Israel will not always win. Let us humbly hope that the morale is understood and the lesson is learnt[5].

(1) Ibid., p. 543.

(2) A battle won by Hannibal against the Romans in the Punic wars. B.C. 216.

(3) A battle won by Scipio Africanus against Hannibal, which ensured the final victory of Rome over Carthage in the Punic Wars. B.C. 202.

(4) Op. Cit., p. 15.

(5) This note was added by the author on February, 1974.

THE YIDDISH CURTAIN:
LAND OF MILK AND HONEY — FOR WHOM?
IRAQI-BORN JEW UNMASKS ISRAEL(*)

Mr. Eliezer Darzi, a 29-year-old Iraqi-born Jew, gave a lecture at a meeting held by the (59) Society, a weekly intellectual discussion group on world affairs, in the Kensington Central Library Hall on 8th October, 1964, entitled "Land of Milk and Honey—For Whom?" Mr. Darzi described himself as a young man who had gone to Israel with the highest hopes, despite the opposition of his family and many of his friends in Iraq. But his youthful hopes were dashed to the ground when he faced the harsh realities of life in Israel.

Israel is "sick with various obsessions", a society that practices racial discrimination against both its oriental Jews and Arab inhabitants. The whole country is fast "galvanizing into a volcano" because of the seriousness of the racial situation. Comparing conditions of Jews in Iraq and Israel, he told his audience that whereas Jews had never met with hostility or persecution from the Arabs, once in Israel he found himself on what he called "the wrong side of the Yiddish curtain". Israel is a vast club, he said. "Members of this privileged club are Israelis of European origin. They control the whole Israeli administrative network". Mr. Darzi added that oriental Jews are treated as mere underlings in Israel, are regarded as inferior in every way and are victimized when seeking employment because some of them had lived in Arab countries.

He declared that Jews were very well off in Iraq before the foundation of Israel in 1948. He went on to say that one of his tasks was to try and dispel the myth

(*) Reproduced from the **Bulletin** of The Republic of Iraq. Vol. 5. No. 6. The issue of Nov. 1964. pp. 17-18. Editor: H.T. Mushtak. Printed by Stephen Austin & Sons Ltd., Herts, England.

created by Israeli authorities that Jews had been badly treated in the Muslim world. When Iraqi Jews were reluctant to leave their birth-places, Zionist agents did everything in their power to convince them of Arab hostility. "Whipped up into a frenzy by agents of the Israeli authorities, they eventually left for Israel" he said, adding that "In the new state oriental Jews quickly found that they were living like animals". Israeli authorities consider oriental Jews as inferior types, justifying themselves by alleging that they have a low standard of ability and education. Mr. Darzi refuted this allegation. Jews in Iraq enjoyed great wealth, a high standard of education and living and occupied a respectable place in the society of which they were an integral part. But even if we suppose for the sake of argument that these Israeli claims concerning Iraqi and oriental Jews are right, then why did Israeli authorities do nothing to alleviate their plight in the past ten years or so? Mr. Darzi asserted that Israel will live in the foreseable future under the dark shadow of oppressive and constant danger, shrouded by tension, anxiety, and restlessness.

Mr. Darzi then went on to talk about his personal experiences in Israel. He said that he left Iraq in 1952 and spent two years in the Israeli army, which is compulsory for all immigrants. At the end of his national service he applied for a job. He had been trained as an electrical engineer and also knew Arabic, Hebrew, and English. Before the interview, Mr. Darzi said, he had been asked by an oriental Jew where he came from. When Darzi replied that he came from Iraq, he was then asked if he spoke English, and if he did, to pretend that he was an English Jew. Mr. Darzi said that he thought the man was mad, but quickly learned how Israeli employers discriminate against Jews from Arab countries. He met a blank wall of

anger when he revealed his origin, and was offered only the most menial tasks as employment. He was told to get an emergency job on the land. "But I discovered that the pay was also an emergency pay". As far as employment is concerned, he added, Israel practises the worst kind of restrictive limitations. Few of the Jews could stand such treatment, as they had never been used to it in the Arab world. He said that some Jews cracked as human beings, some turned cynical — finding their highest hopes dashed — and others "moved towards open rebellion". Mr. Darzi then said that he had got out of Israel by a "fluke". Normally one was not allowed to immigrate out of Israel to other countries. Mr. Darzi concluded by saying that many Jews would prefer to leave Israel, if they could obtain permission or were financially able to do so.

At the end of his lecture Mr. Darzi answered questions from the audience. There were many Arabs present, mainly Iraqis. A large number of British citizens and a sprinkling of Zionists also attended the meeting.

Introducing question time, the chairman of the society said that they had invited Zionist organisations to attend the meeting, and had hoped to have present "some of the best brains in the Zionist movement". The chairman then looked directly at the Zionist section of the audience and added that it did not look as if any of the brains had turned up. Preventing many Zionist childish interruptions, the chairman declared "This is a serious meeting and a serious society", adding that if there were any further interruptions the trouble-makers would be escorted from the hall.

Mr. Hazim Mushtak, Press Attaché at the Iraqi Embassy in London, then begged the chairman's permission to explain the Arab attitude towards the Jews in general. He declared that the Arabs were neither anti-Jews nor professional hate-mongers, and that Jews

have never met and would never meet with persecution in Arab territories. The conflict is not with individual Jews or with groups of Jewish human beings, but with Zionism and Israel. The problem is neither religious nor racial, but political. The Arabs throughout their history have never practised or condoned religious presecution and racial discrimination. They never had ghettoes or committed pogroms. Gas chambers and concentration camps were European and not Arab inventions. Mr. Mushtak went on to say that whereas Israel refused adamantly to implement U.N. resolutions on Arab refugees and does not allow them to return to their original homes in Palestine on the ground of economic and security reasons, Arabia permits and encourages every Jew to return freely to his country of origin and place of birth.

Asked by a member of the audience what was the Israeli attitued towards Jews in the diaspora, Mr. Darzi replied that they regarded them with a certain amount of scorn, but realized that they could supply Israel with money. "They will go on milking the cow", he said.

Quite out of turn, a Zionist supporter then jumped to his feet without the chairman's permission, and shouted: "Why don't you go back to Iraq? Why did you come to England when you left Israel? Go back to Iraq!". The chairman said that this was not a question, but merely personal abuse. Mr. Darzi laughingly said that the "questioner" was a "typical Israeli, bad-mannered and aggressive". "Yes, I am a typical Israeli", the man replied. "You are bad-mannered and aggressive", said Mr. Darzi.

The chairman thanked Mr. Darzi for his courage and straight-forwardness in addressing the society. She said that he had spoken about conditions in Israel, normally over-looked or suppressed, and that his talk was most enlightening and informative.

CHAPTER SIX

PRESS

THE BRITISH PRESS AND THE PALESTINE QUESTION:

A CONVERSATION WITH LORD THOMSON(*)

The Arabic Service of the B.B.C., held a session on 23rd March, 1964 at which Lord Thomson, the well-known newspaer proprieter, and Mr. Zaghoul Al-Sayed, London correspondent of Akhbar al-Yom publications, answered questions on the "freedom of the press and broadcasting", put to them by a gathering of Arab listeners. Lord Thomson's answers were simultaneously translated into Arabic and the programme was broadcast to the Arab world on 10th April. We publish below a number of questions put to Lord Thomson by Mr. Hazim Mushtak, the Press Attache at this Embassy, and Lord Thomson's answers.

Q— Is the press in Britain really and effectively free?

A— Yes, the press in Britain is really and effectively free. It should be so, and as far as I know it is.

Q— If the press in Britain is free why does it always present a certain point of view and one side of the picture on all matters concerning the Arab part of the world, while it ignores in a manner which almost seems intentional the point of view of the true and indigenous sons of this region?

A— I was not aware of this and I believe that the British press serves the interests of its readers by publishing all the news in a spirit of fairness and impartiality. It should do this, and I believe it does it. I

(*) Reproduced from the issue of the **Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq in London of May, 1964, Page 16. Printed by Stephen Austin and Sons, Ltd., Hertford, Herts, England. See a note on the biography of Lord Thomson in Apprendice (A). pp. 109-111.

do not think there is any intentional discrimination against the Arab part of the world.

Q— If the matter was confined to one particular newspaper, or one special occasion, it would be understandable and excusable. But it is true of all newspapers on all occasions. I am speaking in my capacity as Press Attache to the Iraqi Embassy in London. I have repeatedly sent replies and explanations to the British newspapers but rarely have my letters been given any publicity. Is it fair and impartial of the British press to adopt this attitude towards the Arab world? And is it a good thing for British public opinion that it should have only one point of view constantly presented to it? And is it further in the interests of the British people that it should remain ignorant of the realities of the situation in the Arab world?

A—I did not know this before and if the matter is as you say, then it is the cause for surprise and regret. As for me personally, I shall take immediate steps to put the matter right in the newspaper which I own. It is not the duty of the press to tell readers what they should think or what attitude they should adopt. Its duty is to present all the available facts and every side of a question, leaving to its readers the freedom to think and decide on the appropriate attitude to take.

CHAPTER SEVEN

PARTITION

THE BRITISH MANDATE AND THE PARTITION OF PALESTINE:

A CONVERSATION WITH LORD CARADON.

SIR HUGH FOOT(1) ON PALESTINE(2)

In our issue for May we reported a session of the B.B.C.'s Arabic Service programme "Open Forum" in which Lord Thomson, the well-known newspaper proprietor; answered questions put to him by Mr. Hazim Mushtak, the Press Attache at the Iraqi Embassy in London, on the subject of the freedom of the press in Britain.

Today we report another "Open Forum" session held on the 26th May, at which Sir Hugh Foot was one of the platform speakers and answered *inter alia,* a number of questions put to him by Mr. Mushtak on the Palestine question:

Q— In his latest book *A Start in Freedom,* Sir Hugh Foot says: "Diplomats may have to lie for their countries, but they are usually speaking only to other diplomats. Politicians sometimes speak not for Governments but for their parties or only for themselves. But an official can only speak for his Government. He has an absolute obligation never to raise false hopes. He must never make a promise to the people unless he is absolutely sure it can be carried

(1) Presently Lord Caradon, the British Premanent Representative at the United Nations. Currently President of The Security Council. (October/November, 1966).

(2) Reproduced from the Issue of **the Bulletin** of the Republic of Iraq in London of July 1964, Page 11. Printed by Stephen Austan and Sons, Ltd., Hertford, Herts, England. See a note on the Biography of Lord Caradon in Appendice (B). pp. 111-112.

out. The failure of British administration in Palestine was inevitable. The double sin had been committed of raising false hopes both with the Arabs and with the Jews. The hopes were false because they were conflicting. The Arabs who fought with Great Britain in the first world war to throw off the yoke of the Turkish Empire were led to believe that they were fighting for their freedom. The Jews were led to believe by the Balfour Declaration in 1917 that they would win a national home for the Jewish people in Palestine. Relying on British assurances they too fought and worked with us. But Palestine was populated and owned by Arabs".

This is what Sir Hugh Foot says in his book. I should like to ask him which of the two hopes for freedom finds a stronger justification from the moral, legal and factual points of view in Palestine — the hope of the Arabs, the original, genuine and legitimate inhabitants of the land, or the hope of the Zionists who are foreigners, intruders and agressors?

A— I have an idea as to the answer which the questioner wishes or hopes to receive. But that is a difficult and complicated, if not imposible thing. What criterion can we use in determining the rights and aspirations of that party or this party to life and freedom? If we think of the terrible persecution inflicted by the Nazi regime on the Jews in Germany and Europe, we have to admit the rights and aspirations of the Jews to life and freedom. But this does not mean that I deny in any way whatever the rights and aspirations of the Arabs to freedom.

Q— We do not deny the right of the Jewish citizens in every country to freedom and life, but we ask: Is it right that the rights and aspirations of a human group which follows the Mosaic religion and belongs

to different nationalities in the world — is it right that their rights and aspirations to freedom and life should be realized at the expense of the rights and aspirations of the Palestine Arabs to freedom and life? And does justice or humanity permit that the rights and aspirations of the Jews to freedom and life should be realized in the homeland of another people after its forcible expulsion and its deprivation of all its rights and aspirations, as has happened to the Palestine Arab people, especially when it is remembered that the Arabs have never practised or tolerated racial discrimination or religious persecution?

A— I am going to be frank and speak with a full awareness of my responsibility before my conscience. The first and foremost responsibility for the regrettable situation that developed in Palestine rests on the mistaken policy followed in it by the British Government. And I feel ashamed of what my country did in that part of the world. As for my attitude towards the Palestine partition scheme, I think that is clear from my subsequent attitued towards partition in Cyprus when I was Governor and Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in that island which gained its independence in my time. I opposed partition in Palestine as I opposed it in Cyprus.

It is interesting in this connection to quote some of the other views expressed by Sir Hugh Foot in his book *A Start in Freedom*(*). On page 51 he says: "This struggle grew fiercer still, and I later heard that after I left Palestine in 1938 the methods used by some of our troops became more ruthless. For many years afterwards I heard stories of our patrols led by Win-

(*) Sir Hugh Foot: **"A Start in Freedom"**. Published by Hodder and Stoughton, London, (1964).

gate (afterwards to become famous in the war in Burma). He formed his own gang mainly composed of Jewish volunteers and went out to beat the Arab gangs at their own game. His methods were extreme and cruel. He had many successess, but he forfeited our general reputation for fair fighting". Sir Hugh Foot is referring here to the great Arab rebellion in Palestine in 1936, and it is noteworthy that General Moshe Dayan, Chief of Staff to the Israeli armed forces in 1949 and a minister in the present Israeli cabinet started his military life as one of the Jewish volunteers in Wingate's gang.

On Page 57 Sir Hugh Foot says: "Many years later in Cyprus I saw again a conflict between two national claims. I could not forget Palestine and throughout my time in Cyprus I was obsessed with the need to take and keep the political initiative, to avoid at all costs the bloody partition which Palestine endured".

CHAPTER EIGHT

THEFT

THE THIEF AND THE OWNER OF THE HOUSE:

WHO STOLE WHAT FROM WHOM?(*)

World Federation of United Nations Organizations
Centre International 3, rue De Varembe
1211 Geneva 20

Twenty-Third Plenary Assembly, European Centre,
Kirchberg, Luxembourg
10-15 May 1971

Some Comments and Remarks by the United Nations Association of the Republic of Iraq in Reply to specific Allegations made by the UNA of Israel in a Paper on "The Role of WFUNA and its member associations in the International Year for action to combat Racism and Racial Discrimination".

(*) Mr. Mushtak represented the Iraqi UNA at this conference, and submitted the Memorandum which is reproduced here. See a note on the biography of the author in Appendice (C). pp. 112-114.

A MEMORANDUM BY THE UNA OF IRAQ

From now on, nothing, absolutly nothing, of interest to the Arab people will ever go unanswered. This voice, the voice of the Arab nation, will never, never again, fall a victim to a conspiracy of silence in the councils of the World. This may seem unwelcome to some. Others perhaps are going to hear of it for the first time. But, in the interests of truth, world peace and international security, we all have to ask ourselves: What do the Arabs think and feel?...Where do they stand and why?...What are the broad lines and the prominent features of their attitude and position?... How does the picture look on the other side of the hill?...

For more than twenty years, Israel has enjoyed the exclusive privilege of presenting her case here unopposed. Now, for the first time, the Arabs are themselves presenting their case. Let us ask: Have you no interest in balance, fairness and justice?... It is in this spirit that we submit our comments and remarks. And it is in the same spirit that we ask you to consider them carefully.

We take a strong exception to a statement which appeared on page (2) in the Israeli paper on "Racialism and Racial discrimination". Let us reproduce this statement *verbatim*, and discuss it briefly:

> "Systematic hate-campaigns and severe discrimination against Jews are still found in several countries, partly on the initiative or with the connivance of governments. This is the case even in some countries that are themselves labelled

"Semetic". Another indication of the anti-Jewish prejudice is the wide-spread tendency, while affirming the right of every other ethnic-group to statehood in the name of national self-determination, to label the Jewish State of Israel as a "racialist" phenomenon".

This is not only a distortion of the truth,. But it is also the exact opposite and complete reversal of it. Let us remind the Israeli delegation that while Iraq has signed the U.N. convention on human rights, Israel has not done so. Why?... What hidden motive is behind this Israeli attitude?... Is it not because Israel is a racialist state, like South Africa, where racial discrimination is the fundamental unwritten law?... Is it not a fact that Israel practices racial discrimination not only against Palestinian Arabs but also against Oriental Jews?...

The Arabs are not opposed to individual Jews, nor to groups or communities of Jewish human beings, and most certainly not to Judaism, a great world-relegion which they revere and respect. But they are vehemently and legitimately opposed to Zionism. Anti-Semitism is one thing, anti-Zionism is another. The latter does not necessarily involve or presuppose the former. The Arabs are anti-Zionists. They are not Anti-Semites at the same time on that account. The problem is political, neither racial nor relegious. Throughout their long and eventful history, the Arabs have never practiced or condoned racial discrimination or relegious presecution. An Arab is brown, black or white; is Jew, Christian or Moslem. There have never been ghettos or pogroms anywhere in the Arab

homeland. Gas chambers and concentration camps are European and not Arab inventions. We condemn and deplore the genocide practiced by the Hitlerites against European Jews as strongly as we condemn and deplore the genocide practiced by the Zionists against Palestinian Arabs. The Arab-Israeli conflict is not a conflict between Arabs and Jews, but between the indigenous Arab population of Palestine and the other Arab countries, including Oriental Jews, and those whom they consider as Zionist foreign invaders and European white settlers who encroached on their peaceful life and dispossessed them of their country, or expelled them or deminated them, by force.

The Zionists claim that they are "returning" to their promised land which was theirs 2000 years ago. The peoples of the world, with different, and now decreasing, degrees of success, are deliberately kept in ignorance of what happened in Palestine, the Middle-East and the Arab homeland in thoes 2000 years. To the Arabs who have been living there in the past 2000 years, this "returning" looks like conquering. Zionism decided that a zionist state in which there is an overwhelming Arab majority was unthinkable. The Arabs were *in Situ.* They had to be dislodged before the Zionists could make Palestine as Zionist "as England is English". Hence, the Zionists had to take the offensive, to embrace violance as an article of faith and to adopt aggressive methods and forecful means.

If the thief happens by chance to be a Jew, and the owner of the house a gentile, or as in this case, an Arab, should the latter be accused of anti-Semitism simply because he resists the former?... Arab Palestine could have been forcibly seized, and the indigenous population violently expelled, by the Senegalese,

or the Japanese or any group of people for that matter, and they still would have been resisted by the indigenous Arab population of Palestine and the other Arab countries. The race or relegion of the aggressor has nothing to do with the resistance shown by the victim of aggression.

Nazi deplorable crimes against the Jews can never be redeemed by similar Zionist and Israeli crimes against the Arabs. This was asserted publicly time and again by the renowned British historian, Arnold Toynbee.

George Ionides says the following in his book "Divide and Lose": "A great deal of what I say may be unfamiliar to British and Western peoples and unwelcome to some. But Israel and Zionists must expect like any other state or movement, their activities noted and discussed openly. They have no right to expect Jews or gentiles to continue indfinitely to shrink from political criticism of Zionist activities for fear of being accused of anti-Semitism".

Two wrongs do not make a right. The Arabs, innocent of any crimes racial or relegious against the Jews, were, and are still being, victimized by the Zionist powers and their supporters, to redeem, or so they say, crimes committed by European gentiles against European Jews in European countries. Is there no shred of justice left in this inhuman and merciless world?...

Let the fair-minded and freedom-loving people ask themselves the following questions: Are the premises of Zionism really valid?... Is Israel really the solution to the Jewish problem in the world—... Is Zionism the correct answer to anti-Semitism?...

There was a Jewish problem in the world long before the creation of Israel. There still is a Jewish

problem in the world more than twenty years after the creation of Israel. There will always be a Jewish problem in the world so long as it is not solved collectively and internationally on liberal, democratic and humanitarian grounds, by treating the Jews in every country as free citizens with equal rights and obligations. Far from being a final solution to the Jewish problem in the world, Zionism, and particularly Israel, has added to the burden of anti-Semitism which the whole world shoulders, the complex of dual identity and divided loyalty of which the Jew now suffers. Zionism has aggrevated the Jewish problem in the world and has not solved it. It did not solve it, nor will it ever be able to solve it. Zionism is both unable and unwilling to solve the Jewish problem in the world. Zionism does not want a humane and just solution to the Jewish problem in the world. Anti-Semitism is the *raison d'etre* and the *sine qua non* of Zionism. Anti-Semitism is the prerequisite essential minimum condition of Zionism. Both are two sides of the very same coin. Many Zionist leaders often openly declared that if Anti-Semitism did not exist in the world, they should do their best to create it, even if only artificially, in order to facilitate and encourage the immigration of Jews into the promised land. The Arabs are anti-Zionist always and ever. But they are anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish never. This is food for thought at the disposal of the fair-minded and peace-loving people in the whole world.

APPENDICES

A— A Biographical Note on Lord Thomson.

B— A Biographical Note on Lord Caradon, formerly Sir Hugh Foot.

C— A Biographical Note on the Author.

A— A Biographical Note on Lord Thomsan:

Roy Herbert Thomson was born in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, on the 5th June, 1894. He is of Scottish descent through his father, Herbert Thomson, who was a barber by trade: his mother, former Alice Maud Coombs, was an Englishwoman from Somerset.

There was little money in the family and at the age of 14 he had to leave school and start earning his living as a clerk for £1.15.0 a week. He became successively a salesman, farmer, stenographer and bookkeeper.

Generally, there is a specific turning-point in the life of every self-made millionaire, and his came during the slump that followed the 1929 Wall Street crash. He was trying to sell radio sets in Northern Ontario, but business was bad owing to poor local reception. His solution was resourceful and a courageous one for a man with little money. He set up his own small broadcasting station with a second-hand transmitter bought on credit, and ran it on canned music. The studio was the dressing room of the local theatre. He sold not only his sets but advertising time as well, and the money poured in.

His initial venture into newspapers was almost as daring. He took over the local weekly in payment of a bad debt, and of a cash balance of £ 2,000 he paid £ 75 down and the rest in instalments. He made this deal pay, too. One newspaper led to another and in

ten years he had a chain of small city daily-evening newspapers from Vancouver to Quebec and three radio stations as well.

In 1953, a millionaire and verging on 60, a time when most successful men think of retirement, he looked for new fields of activity and turned to the country of his forebears. He flew to Edinburgh and acquired control of THE SCOTSMAN group, then in some financial difficulty.

He completed his biggest deal in the summer of 1959 by taking over Kemsley Newspapers Ltd., the biggest press group in the country. Along with his North American interests this made him the owner of 70 newspapers — Sundays, dailies, evenings and weeklies — spread over five countries, and fresh from this brilliant deal he said, "I'd like to make it a hundred" — a wish that was soon to be fulfilled.

Even without furthe additions to his vast chain, Lord Thomson of Fleet had thus achieved unprecedented progress in newspaperdom.

By 1966, the Thomson Organisation as it is now known, owned 128 newspapers in 11 different countries. These include the world famous SUNDAY TIMES, and the national dailies of Scotland and Wales, THE SCOTSMAN and THE WESTERN MAIL respectively.

Apart from Lord Thomson's highly successful television station in Scotland, Scottish Television Ltd., his television interests embrace 16 different countries, together with radio interests in 4 different countries.

From the time of his first real start — and he had a hard fight to make good — he never looked back, and has added success to success on both sides of the Atlantic and on other continents, in newspaper ownership, television and radio.

Lord Thomson was created a Baron in the New

Year's Honours List 1963. He took the title of Lord Thomson of Fleet of Northbridge in the City of Edinburgh on the 10th March, 1964 and took his seat in the House of Lords on the 18th March, 1964. He is now the owner of both the leading London daily THE TIMES and the influential London Weekly THE SUNDAY TIMES.

B— A Biographical Note on Lord Caradon, formerly Sir Hugh Foot:

Sir Hugh Foot had an adventurous carrer of thirty years in the British Colonial Service. His early experience was in riot and rebellion in Palestine, and in the turmoil of the war years in the Middle East. He was Chief Secretary of Nigeria at a critical time in the constitutional advance of the country with much the largest population in Africa. He was Captain-General of Jamaica for seven years in which the island made spectacular economic and political progress. And then he was the last Governor and Commander-in-Chief in Cyprus when a settlement was reached and the new Republic of Cyprus established.

In *A Start in Freedom* Sir Hugh Foot tells the story of his life, and as he worked with Arabs and Africans and West Indians his experiences confirmed and strengthened his convictions. Lord Caradon is a member of the British Labour Party. He occupied the post of the permanent representative of his country and head of the British delegation at the United Nations. But when he was unable to agree with the British Government, he courageously resigned his post rather than defend a policy with which he fundamentally disagreed.

As he tells us in vivid and forthright language his own personal story we see the man himself, rejoicing

in his remarkable family, working in close accord with leaders as different as President Azikiwe of Nigeria, Prime Minister Bustamante of Jamaica and Archbishop Makarios of Cyprus, loving the peoples he served, welcoming each new task, passionately advocating his own beliefs. He was later created a Baron, took the title of Lord Caradon and occupied his seat in the House of Lords.

C— A Biographical Note on the Author:

Mr. Hazim Talib Mushtak was born in Baghdad on 10th September, 1931. He has spent part of his early youth in Palestine, particularly in Jerusalem, where his father was the Consul-General of Iraq during the early 40's, in the days of the British Mandate. In the course of the Arab-Israeli war of 1948-1949, the Israeli forces occupied his former school "Terra Santa College" and turned it into a military headquarters. They also dynamited the house in which he formerly lived. His memories of Palestine are always alive in his mind, with the vivid impressions of his early youthful days.

Mr. Mushtak studied at the American University of Beirut, and obtained his B.A. degree in Philosophy, psychology and Politics in 1952. He taught the history of ancient civilizations at a high school in Baghdad for one year. Then he went to England for post-graduate research at Merton College, the University of Oxford, where he stayed for seven years and acquired some knowledge of the ancient Greek language from scratch. He obtained his B. Lit. degree in medieval Arabic and ancient Greek philosophies in 1961, with a thesis on al-Farabi and Aristotle. On his

return to Iraq, he taught German and Greek philosophies at the department of philosophy, the College of Arts, the University of Baghdad. At the same time, he lectured on military psychology and psychological warfare at the military academy in Baghdad.

Mr. Mushtak went later to London as a press attache to the Embassy of the Republic of Iraq, where he remained until the 5th of June, 1967, when his country broke her diplomatic relations with the U.K. while there, he enjoyed the close friendship of many leading and prominent British personalities, edited the monthly English publication of the Embassy *The Bulletin of the Republic of Iraq* and lectured annually on the causes, consequences and prospects of the Arab-Israeli conflict, at the Palestine Day Conference organized by The Arab Students Union in the U.K., and at the Royal Naval Staff College at Greenwich, by the kind and hospitable invitation of its commander, as well as at the University of London.

On his return to Baghdad, he became for a time the director of Press at the Ministry of Information. Then he assumed his duties as editor-in-Chief of a prominent, Semi-official, Baghdad daily newspaper. He was later dismissed from this post, when he published a lecture, disregarding a government order to the contrary, an order which seemed to him unwarranted and baseless. As has happaned, the lecture became the centre of a rather heated and violent controversy.

Since then he has been lecturing on the history of ancient Greek Philosophy, as well as holding seminars for post-graduate students on Plato and the Pre-Socratics, at the Department of Philosophy, the

College of Arts, the University of Baghdad.

He has also lectured on Arabic Political Thought in Medieval Islam at the College of Law and Political Science, the University of al-Mustansiriyah, Baghdad.

Mr. Mushtak, who lives and works now in Baghdad, is married and has two daughters, the first of whom was born in London. He has published a number of works in Arabic, including: (Political Thought And Historical Reality), (al-Mawardi: His Political Thought In The Light Of His Historical Background), (Nietzsche: On Cultural Independence) and (The Philosophy of Cultural Independence). He has also delivered public lectures on a wide range of subjects, including: (The Philosophical Foundations Of The Principles Of Political Economy), (The Poineers Of Cultural Independence In Modern Arabic Thought), (A Sin Of Omission: Iraq in 1941), and (The Myth Of Exterminating 6 Million Jews In The Second World War).

At this moment, he is the head of the Department of Philosophy, the College of Arts, the University of Baghdad.

SOURCES:

Books and articles arranged according to the order of their appearance in this work:

1. al-Khalidi, Walid. Reappraisal: An Examination of Certain Western Attitudes to the Palestine Problem. The Middle East Forum (A.U.B.), Beirut, Summer 1958, Vol. 34., No. 8.
2. Childers, Erskine B. Palestine: The Broken Triangle. The Journal of International Affairs. New York. 1965. Vol. 19., No. 1.
3. Caldwell, Wallace Everett. The Ancient World. Rinehart And Co. Incorp. New York. 1959.
4. Robinson, Charles Alexander. Ancient History. The Macmillan Co. New York. 1958.
5. Eearle, Edward Meade. Editor. Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought From Machiavelli To Hitler. Princeton University Press. Princeton, U.S.A., 1948.
6. Jaeger, Werner. Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture. Basil Blackwell. Oxford. 1954.
7. Toynbee, Arnold J. A Study of History. Vol. 8. The Oxford University Press. The American Edition. 1963.
8. Ben-Gurion, David. Rebirth And Destiny of Israel. Thomas Yoseloff Ltd. London. 1959.
9. The Israel Government Year Book. October. 1951.
10. Kimche; Jon and David. Both Sides of The Hill: Britain And The Palestine War. Secker and Warburg. London. 1960.
11. Harwood, Richard. Did Six Million Really Die? The Historical Research Press. Richmond, Surrey, U.K. (Undated).
12. Ben-Gurion, David. Israel: Years of Challenge. Anthony Blond. London. 1964.
13. Sacher, Harry. Editor. Zionism And The Jewish Future. John Murray. London. 1917.
14. Begen, Menachem. The Revolt. W.H. Allen. London. 1951.

15. Sorel, George. Reflections On Violence. English Translation by T.E. Hulme and J. Roth. The Free Press. Glencoe, Illinois, U.S.A., 1950.
16. Childers, Erskine B. The Other Exodus. The Sepectator. London, May 18, 1961. Reprinted: (Palestine: Collected Papers). The Arab Cultural Club. Beirut. 1963. PP. 78-82.
17. al-Khalidi, Walid. Why Did The Palestinians Leave? An Examenation of The Zionist Version of The Exodus of 1948. The Arab Information Centre. London. (Undated).
18. Weizmann, Chaim. Trial And Error. East And West Library. London. 1950.
19. Ionides, Michael. Divide And Lose: The Arab Revolt of 1955-1953. Geoffrey Bles. London. 1960.
20. Montaqu, M.F. Ashley. Editor. Toynbee And History: Critical Essays And Reviews. Porter Sargent, Boston, U.S.A. 1956.
21. Le Bon, Gustave. The Growd: A Study of The Popular Mind. T. Fisher Unwin Ltd. London. 1921.
22. Le Bon, Gustave. The Phychology of Revolution. Putnam. New York. 1913.
23. Pareto, Vilfredo. The Mind And Society: A Treattise On General Sociology. Dover Publications. New York. 1963.
24. Gibbon, Edward. The Decline And Fall of The Roman Empire. The Great Books. Vols. 1 and 2. Nos. 40 and 41. The University of Chicago. The Encyclopaedia Britannica. 1952.
25. Allon, Yigal. The Arab-Israel Conflict: Some Suggested Solutions. International Affairs. Chatham House. Vol. 40. No. 2. April, 1964.
26. Somervell, Dr. D.C. An Abridgement of Toynbee's A Study of History. Vols. 7-10. The Oxford University Press. London. 1957.
27. Lord Caradon (Formerly Sir Hugh Foot). A start In Freedom. Hodder And Stoughton. London. 1964.